

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_148814

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE SOCIAL TREND

THE SOCIAL TREND

BY

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS, PH.D., LL.D.

Professor of Sociology in the University of Wisconsin.

Author of "SOCIAL CONTROL," "SOCIAL PSYCHOL-

OGY," "THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY,"

"THE CHANGING CHINESE," etc., etc.



NEW YORK
THE CENTURY CO.

1922

Copyright, 1922, by

THE CENTURY Co.

Copyright Assigned to
Edward Alsworth Ross
December 1929

✓
2421

00004 156

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

To
MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM ALLEN WHITE
FORWARD-LOOKING DEMOCRATS
OF THE AMERICAN TYPE
THIS BOOK
Is DEDICATED

INTRODUCTION

We moderns are like mariners on a ship sailing an uncharted sea. We cannot lay our course in the light of the experience of our ancestors. None of them ever plowed these waters; that is to say, before us no folk ever practised machine production, let its daughters work away from home, bestowed leisure upon multitudes of its wives, saved its babies, vanquished disease, and slew its foes by mechanism, to the extent that we do. So study of the past can not reassure us as to how these things are going to work out.

Science and Invention have borne us away from the routes followed by any previous society. They have brought us into strange latitudes where we have nothing to go by. And they do not allow us to feel our way deliberately, put out scout-boats, take soundings. They hurry us on. So the best we can do is to set watchers to scan the horizon. The sociologist is just a man in a crow's nest who knows no more of this sea than his fellows. But from his position

INTRODUCTION

he will catch sight of coming dangers—shoals, sunken rocks, derelicts, cross-currents—before they are seen by those on deck.

This book is an attempt of an observer at the masthead to judge the probable course of the ship, to call out what lies ahead and how the ship must bear to starboard or to port in order to avoid trouble.

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS.

MADISON, WISCONSIN,

June, 1922.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

PAGE

I	THE MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES . . .	3
	End of the mollescan stage of mankind.—Is the nation to become a human hodge-podge?—Why population pressure in Asia will increase.—Adaptive fecundity.—Suicide of the adaptive peoples in the presence of low-standard immigrants.—Coming barriers to migration.—Possible war between the blind breeders and the prudent breeders.	
II	THE NECESSITY OF AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY .	16
	A family of sixteen as a pattern.—Is there menace of "race suicide"?—Death-rates falling faster than birth-rates.—The balking of Azrael.—Saving the innocents.—Possible growth of numbers in this country by 2000 A. D.—An endless vista of family restriction.—Why we dare not use <i>all</i> of our natural fertility.	
III	FOLK DEPLETION AND RURAL DECLINE . .	34
	Soundings in retrogressive America.—Strange apathy of young people.—Deadness to higher things.—Decline of religion, education, family morals, and community spirit.—Yet the folk are not degenerate.—What happens when a community loses its cream.—How blight falls upon the leaderless neighborhood.—Program for regenerating the stagnant rural communities.	
IV	DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER	52
	Vanishing of free land in the United States.—Secret of the appeal of the conservation movement.—Why the farmers have become docile.—"Back to the land."—Less welcome for the immigrant.—Rising cost of living.—Appearance of a farm labor class.—American optimism.—Free land as the mother of social and political democracy.—The "spiritual West."—How the passing of the frontier affects personal liberty.	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

PAGE

V THE CHANGING DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN 78

The old home industries.—The home-made displaced by the factory-made.—Migration of the daughters out into industry.—The wives of the well-to-do acquire leisure.—Their quest of "culture."—Are women taken more seriously?—What the wives have to pay for being "supported."—Is access to the job turning girls away from matrimony?—Will it masculinize them?

VI WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD 100

Culture transmitted chiefly through men.—Is this to woman's disadvantage?—How men and women differ in instincts.—Why vice is chiefly a masculine failing.—How men have stamped their innate pugnacity upon the penal system, politics, business, the state, and religion.—Women should be critical and suspicious of man-made institutions.

VII PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS 121

Charity as a cloak.—Private, unendowed charities static rather than dynamic in their influence.—Their administrators conservative.—The effective prevention of poverty causes disturbance to some business interests.—Y. M. C. A. difficulties.—Problems of settlement wardens.—Philanthropy is no substitute for social reform.—The proper sphere of private philanthropy.

VIII PROHIBITION AS THE SOCIOLOGIST SEES IT 137

Opium-smoking as a gangrene.—Alcohol as the vice of the Occident.—Why prohibition had to come.—Commercialization of the liquor traffic.—Laboratory revelations as to alcohol.—Race and strong drink.—How South Europeans became temperate.—An alternative to prohibition.—How the "dry" régime affects woman, the home, and the child.—The glass and good fellowship.—Liquor and politics.

IX THE LEGAL PROFESSION FROM THE SOCIAL POINT OF VIEW 161

Lawyers serve individuals rather than society.—How the gravitation of abler lawyers to the richer side pulls institutions out of plumb.—Lawyers largely

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
waste their efforts against one another.—But the lawyer keeps himself in the best of intellectual trim.—Why society should lean less on the legal profession.	
X THE CONSCIENCE OF THE EXPERT	169
Spread of the laboratory technique into the field of social investigation.—The conscience of the trained inquirer.—How it differs from other types of conscience.—Its strength and its services to the public weal.	
XI TRAINING CITIZENS WITH "SPUNK" FOR SOCIAL SERVICE	174
Spread of the combat idea in business and the professions.—Commercialism as a religion.—The competing social service ideal.—All useful occupations "affected with a public interest."—What ethics our schools should teach.	
XII FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE	183
The dismissal wage in Russia under Nicholas II; under Kerensky.—Importance of economic security for the employed man.—Standards of public or non-gainful employers.—"Hire and fire" policy of industrial employers.—Its inhumanity.—Benefits to be expected from a legal dismissal wage.—How it could be made to work.	
XIII FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR RIGHT	195
Decline of gossip and triviality.—More attention available for matters of real import.—The public the last court of appeal of wronged classes.—Endeavor of local beneficiaries of injustice to throttle publicity.—Free communication still all-important for labor.—No excuse for denying it in labor controversies.—Evil effects of repression.—Ventilated grievances not dangerous to the social order.	
XIV WAR AS DETERMINER	214
Martial determinism.—The invention of weapons has been fateful for peoples and civilizations.—Modern warfare capitalistic.—Consequences.—Significance of the comparative strength of Attack and Defense.—	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The strengthening of Defense makes for peace.—
War may continue mistress of the destiny of society.
—There will be a “next war.”—State worship.—Ef-
fect of democracy, of woman’s suffrage on the future
of war.—No salvation of the nations save in union.

THE SOCIAL TREND

THE SOCIAL TREND

I

THE MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

§ 1

IN 1868 Anson Burlingame negotiated a treaty in which the United States of America and the emperor of China cordially recognized "the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and his allegiance." Fourteen years later our Chinese Exclusion Act made a jest of this fine flourish of American political idealism. It has now become apparent that there are other sociological lessons our people will have to learn under the harsh tutelage of facts.

§ 2

In the past the chief guaranty of stability in the relations of races and peoples has been hu-

THE SOCIAL TREND

man inertia. Most men lived and died within a few leagues of their birthplace. Under the empire of habit they bore their lot, be it never so hard, without reflecting that a brighter life might be awaiting them overseas. Only the exceptional were gifted with the imagination and courage to pluck up and wander forth in the hope of bettering their condition.

But this molluscan stage is not likely to last much longer. Since the birth of men now living, the conditions of the mass movement of peoples have been utterly revolutionized. Not only has steam on land and sea made travel swift and safe and cheap, but the long-distance carriage of human beings has been organized as never before. To-day a peasant living within sight of the rock of Prometheus or the cedars of Lebanon may buy a through ticket to a frontier point in the Canadian Northwest. For the sake of the profit to be extracted from them, penniless laborers are gathered, despatched, and cared for during their long journey to a destination on the other side of the globe as if they were commercial wares.

In the villages of southwestern Asia passenger-tickets to some remote zone of oppor-

MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

tunity are hawked about as newspapers and apples are cried on our streets. The seller will not only incite the peasant to migrate, but will take a mortgage on his home for the passage-money or accept the bond of some relative that the migrant will within a year remit the sum advanced. Parties of "greenhorns," through-billed from their native village by a professional money-lender, are met at the right points by his confederates, coached on the answers to make to the immigration authorities, and delivered finally to some "boarding boss" in this country who is recruiting labor on commission for a construction gang.

Besides such means of detaching the limpet from his rock, local adhesions are everywhere being loosened by the spread of the capacity to read and by the prodding of the minds of the masses by the newspapers.

So, for better or worse, we have entered on the era of facile migration. No longer is population rooted like a tree in its natal soil. Mankind deliquesces and flows in broad streams toward any place on earth which holds out the prospect of a better living. The readiness of petty folk to up and away on slight inducement

THE SOCIAL TREND

is a new thing, but there is no reason to suppose it a passing phenomenon. On the contrary, so far as we can look ahead, the means and desire of removing from one's native land to another will grow. The collecting and forwarding of human beings will become a business and, like any other business, it will be pushed.

§ 3

To-day every people desires to be a *nation*, that is, a *spiritual unit*. In the Roman Empire this ideal played no part, and there resulted an amazing hodgepodge of population. We moderns are afraid of such collections of human odds and ends as came to people Roman Africa or Syria or the valley of the Nile, because we realize that always such muddled mixing begets absolutist government. Dreading a government not subject to the collective will of the governed, we wish a people to be like-minded enough to develop a common opinion upon political questions. When private conduct and public authority are obedient to public opinion, a nation is able almost to dispense with coercion. Furthermore, spiritual oneness prevents the rise of caste barriers to association and intermarriage.

MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

Now, cheap travel and full steerages make mock of this ideal of nationality. Any prosperous country which leaves its doors ajar will presently find itself not the home of a nation, but a "polyglot boarding-house." The thriving areas of the world will come to be populated by a confused party-colored mass, of divers languages and religions and of the most discordant moral and economic standards. Coolies at the breech-clout stage of attire, such as you find in the back districts of the Far East, will jostle the descendants of the Puritans. The enlightened will perforce brush shoulders with idolators, wearers of amulets, and believers in the evil eye. In the same labor market will compete those who sit at meat and those who squat on their heels about a bowl of food, those who insist on a carpet underfoot and those content with a dirt floor, those who honor their wives and those who make them chattels, those who school their children and those who exploit them.

Invariably, when elements with such incompatible traditions intermingle, castes form; so that the nation which persists in welcoming all inoffensive comers will presently find its people

THE SOCIAL TREND

going asunder into closed groups. The fact is, removal from one land to another is becoming so easy that any nation which is economically well off has to choose whether it will see caste barriers rise in it or will itself rear a barrier against non-assimilable aliens.

§ 4

In the masses of the Orient, which steam has made next-door neighbors of ours, the family customs and the status of women are such that land shortage, overcrowding, and economic stress have no appreciable effect in checking the flow of babies. With these folk economic necessity does not prompt to family limitation. If the excess of births over deaths cannot be taken care of by the improvement of agriculture or the rise of factory industry and export trade, and the people cannot migrate, then the growth of the local population is accompanied by deepening poverty and misery until mortality rises to such a degree that human beings die as fast as they are born. At this point population is in equilibrium, and conditions need not become worse. This is "the stationary state," which the greater

MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

part of the Asiatics seem to have reached centuries ago.

Within a generation, thanks to Science's conquest of disease and to the improvement of public sanitation, the death-rate of the more enlightened peoples has been cut in two. In Norway or New Zealand, for example, not over an eightieth of the population die in a year. Now, the application of these new means of saving human lives is upsetting in the Orient the ancient balance between births and deaths. The West, to be sure, sets the example of a low birth-rate as well as a low death-rate; but the influences which pull down the death-rate come into operation in the Orient much earlier than those which pull down the birth-rate.

India and China get pure water, hospitals, antitoxins, serums, and modern medicine before later marriage for girls, the emancipation of wives, obligatory school attendance, and birth-control practices become established among them. During this critical interval, when Asiatics born at the high Oriental rate are dying only at the low Occidental rate, population will tend to increase rapidly, and the surplus, be-

THE SOCIAL TREND

coming mobile under modern inducements to migrate, will move toward any part of the world which promises an easier existence.

Various influences have spared western Europe the grim experience of the stationary state Asia has had. She never reduced her women to the hapless lot of most Oriental women. Her access to the New World afforded relief from the pressure of numbers. Improvement in the industrial arts, especially in the last century and a half, allowed population to grow without making life harder. The impending deliquescence of peoples, particularly of the congested and free-multiplying Asiatics, therefore opens to the Europeans and the descendants of Europeans who find themselves in conditions of comparative comfort in the younger regions of the world a truly appalling prospect of a human deluge.

Nor is this all. Within the last half-century a most hopeful tendency has shown itself in some parts of western Europe, in Australasia, and in North America. With the penetration of intelligence and individualistic democracy to the broader layers of the people, there appears a phenomenon which rarely, if ever, has shown

MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

itself before on any large scale. This is *adaptive fecundity*, or a *birth-rate accommodated to the economic outlook for the next generation*.

When foresight and self-control in respect to family size have become general, a people is in the way of attaining a degree of comfort and an amenity of life such as can never be enjoyed for long by a people of blind fecundity. For its growth is regulated by its standard of living, and with every improvement in agriculture or industry *it raises its standard* instead of allowing the slack to be taken up by mere increase of numbers. No limit can be assigned to the possible amelioration of the lot of the masses when they are canny enough to "salt down" their economic gains in higher standards of living rather than in rearing big families.

Once a people *adapts* its production of children to the economic prospect, the free inflow of blindly fecund immigrants has a most calamitous effect upon its self-perpetuation. Sensing the curtailment of its children's chances, it withholds offspring in just the degree that the alien element expands. In handing on the torch of life it seems to act on the principle, "After you, my dear Alphonse!" For this behavior

THE SOCIAL TREND

the writer coined twenty years ago the phrase "race suicide," which unfortunately has come to be applied to every form of prudence in the matter of family.

For a people which has arrived at an adaptive birth-rate to admit the surplus population begotten by other peoples which multiply without taking thought for the morrow is virtually to cut its own throat. To vary the metaphor, once the camel has been allowed to put his head into the tent, the process of displacement goes on quietly, but inexorably, until the camel is the sole occupant of the tent. It is a painless death, to be sure, which extends over a century or two and proceeds without clash or scandal, but no people which foresees it will adhere to the fatal policy of the open door.

§ 5

Prudence in progeny is so much the product of circumstance and accident that it would be absurd to claim that its practisers are *ipso facto* superior types, whereas the prolific peoples are inferior. Nevertheless, it is certain that the brighter races will be the earliest to look

MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

ahead and limit the size of the family, while the dullard races will be the last to abandon the blind fecundity which characterizes the animal. During the two or three centuries that will be required for the practice of adaptive fecundity to become general among mankind, unhindered immigration, by favoring the blind breeders at the expense of the prudent breeders, would enable the stupid and inert peoples to poach on the preserves of the bright and aspiring peoples. Since the latter will not allow themselves to be elbowed off the earth by the superfluous children of the former, it is certain that every advanced nation will rear immigration barriers. Dogmas of the open door and the melting-pot become absurd in a time when population rolls hither and thither about the globe like particles of quicksilver.

The barriers with which each national comfort area will endeavor to surround itself will not obstruct the passage of culture or culture-bearers. Travelers, officials, students, scholars, merchants, and artists will be able to go anywhere without molestation. It is only the broad masses that will be hindered from migration.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 6

One reason for the hesitation of this and other nations about joining in a league of nations is dread of losing control over immigration. Since every people has an interest in the immigration policy of any people, a strong effort will be made in the interest of world peace to have all disputes between governments arising out of immigration submitted to arbitration. This, however, would tend to the equalization of peoples and races in rights of admission to each country, and would thereby prevent a people discriminating among the streams of immigrants which offer themselves. But, without such discrimination, it cannot remain in any sense a spiritual unity. Hence, it is likely that immigration barriers will be even more jealously reserved from international control than tariff barriers have been.

Will the crowded and blindly multiplying peoples tamely submit thus to be excluded from areas on which they might unload their surplus population? May they not make the rearing of such dikes a *casus belli*? Even now the Japanese show themselves restive in the presence of anything which savors of exclusion, and it is

MENACE OF MIGRATING PEOPLES

not hard to foresee a time when the peoples of India and China and Siam and Egypt may challenge the barriers which keep them out of all the more desirable markets for their labor.

Nevertheless, while the overpopulous nations are certain to become aware and resentful of exclusion, as at once an unjust handicap and an imputation of inferiority, the number of peoples resolved to withdraw from the game of competitive fecundity constantly grows. We have seen Canada, Australasia, South Africa, and several South American republics come into line with the United States in the matter of immigration. As the dense populations become more mobile, the sense of pressure will grow until, perhaps, Europe will make common cause with the younger societies in recognizing in international law the right of every nation to surround itself with such immigration barrier as seems good to it. Whether the pullulating peoples will acquiesce in any such principle is on the knees of the gods. It may be that the most terrific of all wars, which would involve, no doubt, the entire human race, will be fought on this issue.

II

THE NECESSITY OF AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY ¹

§ 1

NOT long ago President Harding noticed in the photogravure section of a Sunday newspaper the picture of Mr. and Mrs. Domenico Zaccahea of New York City and their sixteen children; whereupon he wrote Mrs. Zaccahea congratulating her upon being the mother of such a splendid brood. The gesture won the President friends, no doubt, but did it strike a note which needs to be struck? The father of this family is a porter at twenty dollars a week. There is no evidence that he has unusual gifts to endow his children with. By complimenting him the President of the United States encourages our millions of commonplace citizens to court the gratitude of their country by begetting families of sixteen children. Is the country in need of them?

¹ "Proceedings of the American Sociological Society"; Vol. XVI.

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

The other day I greeted a former student of mine who was born in 1830 when the world had had but half as many inhabitants as to-day. *In her lifetime she has seen 850 millions of persons added to the human race.*

The Divine command, "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth," was uttered to seven people who were all that remained of mankind after the Flood. There are now 250,000,000 times as many people as there were then. How much longer is this emergency mandate to be considered as still in force?

Race suicide?

Since this phrase was launched twenty years ago, portentous bigwigs have been wont to send a chill down the spine of their hearers by picturing the enlightened stocks and peoples as headed for extinction because the full quivers of olden time are becoming rare. The clergyman with few children or none at all has felt entitled to thunder like a Hebrew prophet at couples who stop at three or four children whereas their grandparents gave the world ten or a dozen. Family restriction—which first showed itself in the vital statistics of France about the middle of the last century, became visible in England in

THE SOCIAL TREND

1878, began leaving its mark on Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Australia in the eighties, attracted notice in Italy, Hungary, and Finland just before the close of the century, and appeared in Germany and Austria in the last decade before the war—has been pointed to as if it were a spreading leprosy. No one stops to consider where these peoples would find themselves to-day if they had gone on having progeny in the old happy-go-lucky fashion.

Because it affords such a splendid text for Jeremiads and because a hot controversy has raged about the morality of certain restrictive practices, the shrinkage in the size of families has attracted an enormous amount of attention. Every thoughtful person has heard of it, has been urged to confront it as “a grave problem.” On the other hand, few but statisticians, life insurance actuaries, and public health officers have noticed the extraordinary lowering of the death-rate which has been brought about in the last forty years. No one has viewed it “with alarm” or lifted a trumpet against it. It has stolen upon us quietly like a genial south wind in February, like a night drizzle after an August drought. And yet in most countries, so far as

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

population growth is concerned, it quite balances and neutralizes that shortage of the baby crop which has inspired so many gloomy prophecies.

The thing is as plain as the black and white squares on a chess-board. Take the fourteen European countries which have worth-while vital statistics running back for forty years or more. Compare their records for the half-decade 1881-85 with those of the last half-decade before the war, viz., 1906-10. You will find that in *nine* of them the death-rate fell farther than the birth-rate; so that in 1910 their natural increase was actually *greater* than it had been a quarter of a century earlier, before forethought and prudence in the matter of family had given much evidence of its presence among the masses. Taking the average for the fourteen peoples, it appears that while the number of annual *births* per thousand of the general population was *five* less at the end of the period, the number of annual *deaths* per thousand was *five and one half* less!

Impatient with the limitations of ink-on-paper, a certain yellow-journalist used to wish, when he had something of great moment to communicate to the public, that he could "make a noise

THE SOCIAL TREND

resembling thunder.” The statistician laments that he cannot thunder to a public which admires families of the Zaccachea type that in the last quarter-century for which we have complete statistics (1881-85 to 1906-10) the death-rate of Finland, Norway, Sweden, and Scotland declined about a *fifth*. That of Austria, Belgium, Denmark, England and Wales, Hungary, Italy, Spain, and Switzerland was lowered about a *fourth*; while that of Australia, Bulgaria, and Holland was reduced about a *third*. In the same period the mortality of the dozen chief cities of the world was reduced by *more than one third*.

Our own country has been tardy in collecting vital statistics. However, we have this most significant fact. In 1900 the death-rate in our “registration area”—which then included two fifths of the American people—was 17.6 per thousand of the population. In 1919 in a registration area which had expanded until it included three fourths of us, the rate was 12.9—a reduction of a fourth in nineteen years!

According to the committee on elimination of waste in industry of the American Engineering Council the duration of life in America has

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

been increased by five years since 1909. In the last eight years the expectation of life of the industrial policy-holders of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. has been extended from forty-six and one half years to fifty-one years.

§ 2

Save our ingenuity in devising contrivances for blotting out human life, nothing in our time is so sensational as our success in vanquishing certain diseases. For example, in 1911 in the United States the deaths per 100,000 population from the fevers, including typhoid, typhus, and malaria, were only *one seventy-third* as numerous as the deaths from these causes in British India. These fevers are not tropical maladies and there is no climatic or geographic reason for their great prevalence in India. Old records show that these diseases played havoc in this country a century ago. The reason why they scourge us so little to-day is that public authority has stepped in and applied the discoveries of preventive medicine.

It is this agency that has chased from us those grisly servitors of Azrael, bubonic plague, cholera, yellow fever, and smallpox. Moreover,

THE SOCIAL TREND

thanks to increasing personal and social appropriation of the fruits of medical advance, another four of his reapers, viz., typhoid, diphtheria and croup, tuberculosis, and pneumonia have had their sickles dulled. Even at our present stage of knowledge, did the public but will it, they would have not much more power over us than cholera has.

The progress of child-saving alone suffices to offset a large part of the fall in the birth-rate. Peeps into the infant mortality of the less advanced peoples suggest that *right down through history from a third to two thirds of those born have perished in the cradle*. A decade ago a quarter of the babies born in Hungary and Russia failed to live a year. In Chile in 1913 I found the loss to be a third, in some cities 47 per cent.! A decade ago Moscow parents were losing half their infants within a twelve-month. As for the Orient, the fate of its innocents is horrifying. In 1910 in the innermost province of China an American medical missionary with twenty years of practice gave me his opinion that from 75 to 85 per cent. of the children born in his district die before the end of the second year. The first census the Japanese

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

took in Formosa showed that half of the babies born to the great Chinese population there do not live as long as six months.

On the other hand, where the lessons of modern hygiene and medicine have been well conned, infants are saved with a success that our forefathers would have attributed to magic. Already there are perhaps a dozen peoples that are getting more than nine tenths of their children through the first year of life. Our country is near the foot of this enviable class but, nevertheless, there are twenty-five American cities which save nineteen babies out of twenty. It is in New Zealand, however, that the wee ones bear a charmed life. In that happy land there are good-sized cities that lose the first year only *one infant in twenty-seven!*

§ 3

That in our huge composite American population clogged with some extremely backward elements Death should take, year after year, but one in seventy or one in seventy-five is an utterly new thing in the experience of peoples. Even if we were a stationary people and not an expanding people, I suppose that only one in fifty

THE SOCIAL TREND

or one in fifty-five would die in a twelvemonth. In all the life of our race, extending over a thousand centuries and more, the like of this has never been known. It behooves us to *adapt* our behavior to it as we adapt our behavior to artificial light or power machinery or the automobile. But we *see* these things, so we recognize at once the necessity of conforming our conduct to them. On the other hand, most of us *do not see* this latter-day crippling of Azrael and therefore do not realize that any change in our standards of judgment is called for.

For example, through its first millennium and a half—during which its doctrines crystallized—the Christian church was in the presence of a human mortality which must have been *from two to four times* that which we experience today. Naturally the church became fixed in the idea that overpopulation is nothing to worry about and in her profound wisdom she branded as a sin the deliberate curtailment of conjugal fecundity. Can this position be maintained indefinitely into the future in view of the astounding success of modern medical science and sanitation in enabling people to live out a normal life term?

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

§ 4

If only the good men who are so dogmatic in this matter would condescend to apply the test of arithmetic!

Conceive that as a people we came under the conviction of sin with respect to our current widespread practice of restricting the size of the family. Suppose that, while keeping mortality down to thirteen per thousand, our women would feel it their duty to emulate the prolificacy of the *hausfraus* of Prussia during the decade before the war when the Kaiser constantly incited them to produce what turned out to be "cannon-fodder." Ignore migration into or out of this country. Well, then, by the end of this century the United States would contain more people than all Europe does to-day.

Suppose again that while preserving human life with our present success we should for the next seventy-eight years have children at the present rate of the Spaniards, the Portuguese, and the Italians. In that case, the year 2000A. D. would see the population of our country more than five hundred millions.

However, the Teutons taught us to stigmatize the Latins as "decadent," and there is, in-

THE SOCIAL TREND

deed, reason for suspecting that in these peoples a great many couples have no more children than they think they can provide for. Their upper class and *intelligentsia* are by no means careless multipliers. Let us turn, then, to the simple and unspoiled people of the Balkans. If American women should give themselves to child-bearing with the whole-heartedness of the women of Bulgaria and Rumania, by the close of this century our country, if it kept its present mortality, would boast as many human beings as there are now in all Asia and Africa!

Go a bit further. Suppose that American womanhood rose still more nobly to the demands of their heaven-ordained destiny. Imagine that they bore children as freely as the secluded wives of British India or the women of Russia under Nicholas II. Of course, with so many babies in the population it would be hard to keep our low death-rate. Then, too, low mortality and big families simply do not go together. Various studies show that children born into families of more than nine are two or three times as likely to perish in their infancy as those born into families of less than five. Moreover, many women would have their lives cut short by ex-

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

cessive child-bearing. There are settlements of the foreign-born in our Middle West in which the typical woman dies trying to bring into the world a twelfth, fifteenth, or twentieth baby.

Nevertheless, imagine that with the aid of more skill and science we could hold our death-rate down to thirteen while the birth-rate swelled to forty-eight per thousand. In that case our country at the end of this century would have a population equal to that of the entire globe at the outbreak of the World War!

Let us venture on another hypothesis. More than any other people in the world the French Canadians realize what we are authoritatively assured is the Christian ideal in this matter of reproduction. Nowhere are women so submissive to the admonitions of their spiritual director, so resigned to the burden of children that is laid upon them. Hence a fecundity in certain parts of the Province of Quebec which is not matched in any other part of the world where there is such a thing as vital statistics. In a year fifty-five babies are born per thousand of population—nearly *two and a half times* as many as in our “registration area.”

To be sure, it is the graveyard rather than the

THE SOCIAL TREND

nursery that is populated by these heroic sacrifices. Students of the Loyola School of Sociology and Social Service in Montreal have established that a baby born in that city is twice as likely to die in infancy as a Toronto baby, more than twice as likely to die as a New York baby, and four times as likely not to survive the first year as a baby born in Brookline, Massachusetts. This, however, has really nothing to do with the matter of fulfilling one's duty in respect to reproduction.

Now if our people came to be as docile and devout as these *habitants* of French Canada, every couple willing to have "as many children as God sends," why, then about three thousand of those born among us this year would as octogenarians see our country peopled by *three billions* of human beings; that is, by thrice the population of Asia and Africa to-day with seventy million folks thrown in for good measure. Of course no such numbers could be maintained here, but the calculation shows what we let ourselves in for if we take the Zaccachea family as our ideal.

Suppose that, instead of looking at the performance of other peoples, we should go to our

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

ancestors for a standard. We do not know the birth-rate or death-rate of our great-grandparents, but we do know that through the forty years intervening between the inauguration of George Washington and that of Andrew Jackson the natural growth of our population averaged 3 per cent. a year. Should we equal their record for the remainder of this century the American people would then be two thirds as numerous as the present inhabitants of the globe!

§ 5

With such Matterhorns of prolificacy in full view, how mortifying appears the actual performance of American mothers! Even with the aid of millions of big-family foreign-born in our midst, their fruitfulness is only about a third of that of the French Canadians in the good old days and a mere half of what you find among the Slavic peoples. Our excess of births over deaths is only 70 per cent. Our natural growth of population is a little less than 1 per cent. a year. Keeping this up for seventy-eight years and ignoring immigration, we should come to the year 2000 A. D. with only 222 millions of

THE SOCIAL TREND

population—a sorry showing if you want numbers.

It is evident then that millions upon millions of American married couples—perhaps the majority of those of native stock—are in some degree slackers. They are regulating the size of their families, and this by other means than marital abstinence. Nor is there any prospect that the situation will improve. For the death-rate of our people will be brought still lower. In twenty years the experimenters, the doctors, the public health agencies, and the social workers have pulled it down more than a quarter. Perhaps they can pare it down another quarter in the next twenty years.¹ Why, even if there were no fresh conquests of disease, the mere putting into effect *everywhere* among us of measures which are now operating with success *somewhere*

¹ In a recent bulletin Dr. Louis I. Dublin, statistician of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., says: "It is obvious that at least one-third of the deaths that occur each year may be prevented or postponed. In some communities, the proportion of such deaths may reach even one-half." He deems it entirely possible to extend the expectation of life to sixty-five years by putting into general operation the forces which in localized areas have so definitely demonstrated their capacity to reduce the death rate. He believes that the year 1930 will see a large part of this addition to the life span actually accomplished.

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

would reduce our death-rate to one in a hundred each year.² So one need not strain his imagination in forecasting an annual mortality of *nine in a thousand*, or even *eight*. But, as more parents and grandparents round out their lives and death is well-nigh banished from the nursery, there will be fewer gaps in families to be filled and we shall see the annual baby crop shrink to nineteen or even eighteen. Even then, however, our population will be growing as fast as it now is and certainly as fast as it is possible for it to grow without lowering our standard of living.

There is, then, ahead of us an endless vista of restriction of the size of families. We shall leave unused an increasing portion of that fertility which became established in our species long ago in order to meet a rate of wastage which no longer presents itself in civilized life. In China about all of human natural fertility is needed in order to balance deaths, particularly the excessive mortality of infants. In southern and eastern Europe about half of this fertility is now required to maintain numbers; in cen-

² By cutting our infant mortality rate to that of New Zealand three and a half years could be added to the life expectation of the American people.

THE SOCIAL TREND

tral Europe a third; in Scandinavia, Great Britain, Australasia, and the United States a fourth or less. Some of us will live to a time when a *fifth* or even a *sixth* of human reproductive power will suffice to keep up our population. To be sure, after several decades a stationary population would include such heavy contingents of the later age-classes that the annual death-rate would hover in the neighborhood of fifteen, and perhaps 30 per cent. of human fertility would be required if numbers were to be maintained. Even then, however, the calling into operation of as much as *half* of the reproductive power of our race would be sheer madness.

Fewer births in sympathy with fewer deaths, in order that human increase shall not outrun wealth production, signifies that a new thing has come into the life of mankind; viz., a fecundity that *adapts* itself to the economic prospect. In view of their miraculous victories over disease, *adaptive fecundity* is, indeed, the only safeguard of the enlightened peoples against the dismal fate of overcrowded China. If such deliberate limitation of family size is a sin, then what an appalling prospect of Divine displeasure opens up! For, with further reductions in the mortal-

AN ADAPTIVE FECUNDITY

ity rate, an increasing proportion of American parents, an increasing proportion of the members of the white race, an increasing number of the peoples of the globe *will either have to violate what they are assured is God's law or else multiply until it will be necessary to hang out on our planet the "Standing Room Only" sign!*

§6

If we have no cause to fear lest the advanced peoples grow too slowly it does not follow that all is well. Curtailment of fecundity is most practised by the capable and ambitious and least by the inert and commonplace. Hence the people grows faster at the bottom than at the top. While the general American birth-rate is quite reasonable under the circumstances, there ought to be bigger families among the rising, and smaller families among the stagnating; more progeny left by the gifted, and fewer by the dull; less prudence in the good homes, and less recklessness in the hovels and tenements.

But that, as Kipling would say, is another story.

III

FOLK DEPLETION AND RURAL DECLINE

§ 1

IN September, 1911, I spent a fortnight with a friend on a walking trip in certain parts of New England in order to get terms of comparison for certain studies I was making of the people of the Middle West. The counties I visited were chiefly those which for a long time have been losing population and gaining no new industries. I talked freely with Y. M. C. A. secretaries, school principals and superintendents, clergymen, physicians, heads of State institutions, officials, business men, and other intelligent citizens. The data were not secured for publication, and I now submit them only in the hope that they may throw light on a problem that is presenting itself in those parts of the East and Middle West which have contributed most heavily to the upbuilding of other commonwealths.

FOLK DEPLETION

The striking thing I found in these counties was the opinion generally held by thoughtful people that *the community is not up to its former standard*. Whether this is the case or not, the fact that those in the best position to know *think so* is worthy of serious attention.

There is complaint that the young people lack "ginger." A leader in boys' work said that his lads cannot be persuaded to go on a "hike" to mountain or lake on Saturday afternoon in order to camp there overnight. The prospect of a nine-mile walk "scared them out." Twenty might promise, but scarcely half a dozen would show up at the rendezvous. If a "rig" were provided, all were glad to go. The boys in the larger centers were said to be more active in disposition. In the small villages there sometimes is no response to the "Boy Scout" program. A hotel proprietor noticed that, whereas in his youth every boy had some work to do and did it, now many boys between fifteen and eighteen are irresponsible and worthless, and their parents support them in idleness. The more spirited and ambitious boys keep going away, so that those who remain are rather apathetic. He remarked that the feeling of the young fellows about their base-

THE SOCIAL TREND

ball games with other towns does not run as high as it did in his boyhood. Some school principals observe that during recess their pupils are content to stand about and talk, chaff, and play tricks on one another instead of taking part in active games. In high school the boys show very little interest in their base-ball team, and when a match game with another school comes off not more than half of the boys and one fifth of the girls attend. Few will pay ten cents a month to support their athletic league, although they spend their money freely enough on motion-picture shows.

In a river community in which motor-boating is very popular, it has been found impossible to interest the young people in water sports. Their one stimulus to sustained physical exertion is dancing.

A certain Y. M. C. A. secretary said that the boys he works among display normal physical energy, but that the young men over eighteen are noticeably sluggish, owing to the fact that before the age of eighteen most of the more energetic have gone away to the cities. There was much complaint that lads quit school as soon as

FOLK DEPLETION

the law allows, and then, in spite of parental entreaties, loaf about town and go to the bad.

§ 2

I was astonished to learn that quite often it is necessary to show the school children how to play. School men hailing from other States were puzzled by this strange juvenile apathy. Left to themselves, the children stand about, scuffle, or play practical jokes on one another. In some cases, when shown how to play regular games, they respond eagerly and idolize the teacher who has shown them how to play. Clergymen find if they can get a group of boys to take "hikes" in summer, skate in winter, and engage in regular sports, many of them will eventually become interested in religion and education. The usual complaint is that the young people are not interested in *anything* worth while, but that they play cards, dance, visit motion-picture shows, and run the streets. School principals say that it is very hard to get work out of pupils, that they have to amuse the pupils in order to get along with them. From their elders they

THE SOCIAL TREND

inherit the tradition that the school is a place for fun and that the teacher is their natural enemy, to be foiled if possible. Among the pupils of the high school the corporate spirit is said to be weak. The singing schools, debating societies, and lyceums which, two generations ago, played so great a part in the life of the rural young people are no longer heard of. The only collective recreation the young people organize is the dance.

There is general complaint that the rising generation is frivolous, and indifferent to all higher things. "Not a particle of zeal or ambition among the young people either in village or country districts," says a county Y. M. C. A. secretary of wide knowledge. "Those in the church won't do a thing for its institutional life," says a clergyman. "No bottom; nothing to build on," comments a religious worker. A professor in a certain college had been struck by the absence of social enthusiasms among the students. In the entire three hundred there was not one to whom the leadership of a boy's club could be entrusted. Only the "sissy" type of young man offered himself for social service.

FOLK DEPLETION

§ 3

In the stagnating counties the problem of the juvenile presents itself in the acutest form in which I have ever known it. There is no provision for the recreative life of young people; no playground, meeting-place, or social center.

The school playground is merely a bare area, the churches rarely offer anything social or recreative, and the young people seem to have lost the power to use the school-house in the old ways. Said a town official to me, "One of the greatest problems before the American people to-day is what to do with the young people in the evening." He did not know that in many localities the problem has been met and solved. "Hanging about the streets" is rife and "haunting the pool-rooms" is growing. Cigarette smoking is general among the boys and meets with little or no parental opposition. Sex consciousness arrives early and, in the absence of competing interests, the effects are alarming.

As regards the relations between boys and girls, it would be idle for me to present here such statements as were given to me, for they would be received with a shout of incredulity. However, they are not in the least abnormal or

THE SOCIAL TREND

against nature. They are precisely what may be expected under the three conditions of lack of wholesome and innocent recreation, absence of religious influences, and want of parental supervision.

"Talk about the purity of the open country!" said one. "The moral conditions among our country boys and girls are worse than in the lowest tenement-house in New York. In the cities the youth has interests, something to take his mind off his instincts. Here life in the isolated farm-houses during the winter is likely to be lonely and dreary for young people. Nobody to see, nobody going by. What is more natural than that the boys should get together in the barn and while away the long winter evenings talking obscenity, telling filthy stories, recounting sex exploits, encouraging one another in vileness, perhaps indulging in unnatural practices?" The head of a State institution said that his most sordid and hopeless cases of moral deterioration came from isolated homes among the hills. He believes that 75 per cent. of the bad boys and girls who are not mentally deficient could have been saved if they had been provided with proper play and recreation.

FOLK DEPLETION

§ 4

Lament over the inattention or indifference of parents to the morals of their children was universal among those I met. A State Y. M. C. A. officer said to me that among the hundreds of boys in his boys' clubs he had found but two who had been instructed by their parents in matters of sex. In some parts most parents give their daughters no instruction in sex, with the result that the girls may go wrong without the slightest knowledge of the possible consequences. It is said that parents don't pretend to know where their sons and daughters are in the evenings and don't care. They are ignorant of the evil effects of premature sex life, and have no concern about the conduct of their young people.

The want of public spirit and the absorption of well-to-do people in their private pursuits and pleasures is said to be very marked. In one town a responsible man declared that "eight out of ten business men here contribute nothing to the leadership of the social life of the community. Their wives play bridge, entertain one another, tittle on the sly, and in some cases do worse. Their interest in home, or church, or school is very slight." In another town I was

THE SOCIAL TREND

told that men who are prominent or in a position to exert an uplift influence refuse to take a moral stand on any matter for fear of losing their customers or clients, hurting their business relations, or raising their taxes.

§ 5

The clergymen are often alive to the situation and wish to socialize the work of the church so as to make it a positive influence in the lives of the young people, but their deacons and trustees will not allow the building to be used for anything but worship. As a consequence the church is declining in attendance and support and in some communities has come to be a negligible factor. I was told that in the open country people never think of going to church, and many youths have never seen the inside of a sacred edifice. Earnest men in the pulpit and out of it complain that the church does not make itself felt on moral issues such as gaming, divorce, and juvenile vice. They lament that it is not conscious of a mission to the community. Many of the younger clergymen have a social message, but under the circumstances they are quite powerless. Said one clergyman: "The

FOLK DEPLETION

stubborn individualism of the old deacons and elders is breaking the hearts of the earnest pastors up here. The conservative members are killing the church."

§ 6

Some of my informants offered no explanation of these bad tendencies. Some look upon them as the trend of the age, and imagine that the whole American people is going to the dogs. Others think that people about them have degenerated. The explanation which occurred to me, because the phenomena I observed do not differ essentially from what may be observed in certain rural parts of a dozen older States, I laid before at least a score of intelligent persons, and not one disputed its plausibility.

It seems to me that the root of the trouble is not *folk degeneration* but *folk depletion*. Certain of the counties visited had more rural population eighty years ago than they have to-day. For three, even four generations the hemorrhage has been going on. If the emigration to the cities and to the West had carried away just average persons, it could not affect the characteristics of the people; but if those who left

THE SOCIAL TREND

were unusual in respect to some native quality, then their leaving would impoverish the people in respect to this quality.

Perhaps the trait most distinctive of those who cut their moorings in order to follow the call of distant opportunity is the *spirit of initiative*. They have it in them to *make a start*, in spite of home ties, the bonds of habit, and the restraints of prudence. Had they not emigrated, their spirit of initiative would have shown itself along other lines. They would have been among the first in the community to change their method of farming, to introduce some new crop, to embark in an untried industry, or to promote some community enterprise. A heavy outflow of this element need not leave the community poorer in physique, or brains, or character, but it does leave it poorer in natural leaders.

This is serious because natural leaders are of the utmost value to society. Not only is it they who launch improvements, but they perform a peculiar service in keeping up to the mark the various institutions which minister to the higher life of the community. The bulk of the people are unable to start or direct those

FOLK DEPLETION

institutions, although they appreciate and support them when once they exist. Often have I seen a depressing slump in the religious, social, and recreative life of a neighborhood, following the moving away of two or three families of initiative. Usually those who insist upon and know how to get good schools, vigorous churches, and abundant means for social enjoyment, are a minority, often a very small minority. My own observation is that frequently the loss of even the best tenth will cut down by 50 per cent. the effective support the community gives to higher interests.

The continual departure of young people who would in time have become leaders results eventually in a visible moral decline of the community. The roads are neglected, which means less social intercourse and a smaller turnout to school and church and public events. School buildings and grounds deteriorate, and the false idea takes root that it pays to hire the cheaper teacher. The church gets into a rut, fails to start up the social and recreative activities which bind the young people to it, and presently ceases to be a force. Frivolity engrosses the young because no one organizes singing schools,

THE SOCIAL TREND

literary societies, or debating clubs. Presently a generation has grown up that has missed the uplifting and refining influence of these communal institutions. There is a marked decline in standards of individual and family morality. Many couples become too self-centered to be willing to rear children. It is observed that people are not up to the level of their forefathers, that they are coarser in their tastes and care less for higher things. Vice and sensuality are not so restrained as of yore. The false opinion goes abroad that the community is "degenerate" and therefore past redemption.

All this may result from the continual abstraction from a normal population of too many of that handful of born leaders which is needed to leaven the social lump.

Let no one imagine that the symptoms of folk depletion are confined to the stagnating counties of New England. This phenomenon has a wider range than most people suspect. The disfranchisement of seventeen hundred citizens of an Ohio rural county for selling their votes lets in a ray on the dry rot of spots that have missed the electrifying touch of railroad or city. The knots of gaping tobacco-chewing loafers that

FOLK DEPLETION

haunt the station platform in some parts of the Middle West prove that the natural peacemakers of that locality have gone to create prosperity elsewhere. In parts of southern Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and even as far west as Missouri there are communities which remind one of fished-out ponds populated chiefly by bullheads and suckers. I have not come upon the phenomenon, however, in Minnesota, Iowa, or the States farther west.

On the basis of wide studies, Dr. Warren H. Wilson, head of the church and country life department of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, declared in 1909 :

Allowing for some exceptions, not too numerous, it may be said that throughout the prosperous and productive farming regions of the United States, which have been settled for fifty years, community life has disappeared. There is no play for the children ; there is no recreation for young people ; there are no adequate opportunities for acquaintance and marriage for young men and women ; there is not a sufficient educational system for the needs of country people ; and there is not for the average man or woman born in the country an economic opportunity within reach of his birthplace, such as will satisfy even modest desires. There is not in a weak community that satisfaction of

THE SOCIAL TREND

social instinct which makes it "a good place to live in." Time was in New England and New York and Pennsylvania when there was a community to which every farmer belonged with some pleasure and pride. The absence of community life throughout these country regions expresses to-day what one man calls "the intolerable condition of country life."¹

If this widespread moral sag betokened a degeneration of the people, what an appalling prospect would lie before us! But, as I see it, only rarely is degeneration present. The bulk of the people in these rural counties are essentially like the bulk of Americans of the same stock in any other part of the country. They are normal, not subnormal. Their engrossment in business and pleasure, their indifference to cultural and spiritual interests, their lack of public spirit, are precisely what you would find in most other communities *but for the presence of a certain small minority who set strict standards of private conduct, family life, and child up-bringing, and persuade the majority that looser standards and practices are "low."* It is these who take the lead in communal undertakings, better

¹ "Publication of the American Sociological Society"; Vol. V, p. 174.

FOLK DEPLETION

roads, schools, churches, and organized school life. The children of the rest are enlightened and refined by the influences radiating from such agencies, and thus the moral plane of the community rises from generation to generation.

No doubt community decline from folk depletion has been occurring sporadically for thousands of years. If it has remained for our time to diagnose the disease and its cause, it is because the double attraction of city and frontier, coupled with the influence of schools and newspapers, has depleted our old rural communities with an unprecedented rapidity. But there are indications that ours is not the only country affected with the malady. From England, Italy, and Scandinavia come tales of rural populations retrograding, owing to the loss of their ambitious units by emigration.

§ 7

The question of remedies for folk depletion brings up nearly the whole problem of the amelioration of country life, and the lines of procedure can be only briefly indicated.

1. The more ambitious young people migrate because they imagine larger opportunities of

THE SOCIAL TREND

individual success and social usefulness elsewhere. The only way to retain this precious leaven is to show them satisfying opportunities at home. Either new industries should be introduced, or else they should be led to perceive new possibilities in old industries. Here is the rôle for a strong State agricultural college and experiment station.

2. By traveling exhibits, local demonstration farms, or a State farmers' adviser in every county, the State should provide the eager and capable young people with good reasons for staying on the farm. By serving as object-lessons to their less progressive neighbors, their success in improved agriculture and in horticulture will eventually lift the economic plane of the whole community.

3. The rural pastor should be specially trained for his job, and the ministry of a rural church should be looked upon as an honorable life career.

4. The standard of local public education ought to be determined less by the will of the people of the locality and more by the fixed purpose of the people of the whole State.

5. The recreative, social, and civic services of

FOLK DEPLETION

the school ought to be made equal in importance to the giving of instruction to boys and girls.

6. The pay, emoluments, and dignity of the teaching profession ought to be such as to attract into it ambitious, positive, and dominant individuals who, in whatever community they may teach, will of themselves take the lead in stimulating higher interests and inducing others to aid in supporting these interests.

7. Better school buildings, grounds, and equipment, by the aid they can lend in the economic and moral rehabilitation of the community, would prove to be, not an extravagance, but a profitable investment.

8. At present the subject-matter of instruction in rural schools directs the thoughts and longing of the pupils toward the cities. The curriculum ought to be so modified as to make life in the country hold out to them more of interest and promise.

9. Organization of farmers should be promoted, not only for the improvement of their material conditions, but also to provide opportunities for social enjoyment and to give a leverage for natural leaders among them.

IV

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

§ 1

THE public thinks that a great social change can hinge only on some great event; a battle, treaty, law, or party struggle. The sociologist, however, knows that among the greatest happenings are things which do not occur at any particular time or place. The social current may be bent most by things which never get into the despatches at all. About twenty-five years ago American society turned the sharpest corner it has turned since the abolition of slavery; and yet the public noticed nothing then, nor even now does it generally realize what happened.

Throughout its history the American people have developed in the presence of abundant land. Always there was good land to be had for little or nothing if only you would take the trouble to go West. Wherever it might be—on the Great Kanawha or on the Columbia,—the

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

frontier spelt opportunity for the common man. Neither fever and ague nor scalping savage could check the westward stream of land-seekers hoping to get their feet on the first rung of the ladder. The passion for economic independence was so intense that, by the time a region had been sparsely occupied, it would be contributing to the tide moving on to settle the frontier beyond. It is a fact that each tier of Western States was settled principally by overflow from the States nearest to it. The Ohio Valley furnished the people who settled along the Upper Mississippi, and their children in turn played the major rôle in peopling the trans-Missouri region.

The westward movement was a response to the lure of opportunity rather than to the lash of need. This is shown by the way in which the rate of expansion kept pace with the growing liberality of the Government to the settler. The more nearly the public domain was offered as free land, the more eager was the rush to the frontier. Settlement spread from the Alleghanies to the Mississippi much more slowly than from the Mississippi to the Rocky Mountains. Through the nineteenth century the rate of

THE SOCIAL TREND

westward march of the frontier was continually accelerated, so that it was never moving so fast as it was in the last two decades before it ended.

But, more than two decades ago, the frontier as a large determining factor in the life of the American people ceased to exist. To be sure, the first grapple with rude nature is still to be witnessed in some parts. In Idaho I have seen pioneers literally hewing their farms out of the white pine forests and growing grain amid the stumps, just as a hundred years ago pioneers were doing amid the hard woods of Indiana. The few remaining parcels of virgin land can have, however, no such significance for our people as did the frontier when it was a broad, irregular belt stretching unbroken from the northern to the southern boundary of the country, in which were created nearly every year some tens of thousands of new homes. There is still public land of a sort to be had, but, as a great shaping condition, the frontier has disappeared and with it has ended the expansive free-land epoch that constituted our national childhood. Without wishing it, yet with nobody to blame, we have entered upon the era of limited natural resources and intensive utilization.

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

The change is almost as sharp as the youth experiences when he ceases to receive aid from home and for the first time is thrown upon his own resources.

There is, to be sure, in the Far West, much waste which will in time be brought under cultivation; but dry land that costs \$30 to \$50 an acre to get water to is not an opportunity for penniless families such as used to move out upon the public domain and forthwith achieve financial independence. When I was a boy in Iowa the farmer's son on the twenty-first birthday was presented by his father with a team, a wagon, and perhaps a few farm implements. After working a year for wages, he married the girl of his heart, put bows and canvas on his wagon, and drove out to the margin of settlement in Kansas, Nebraska, or the Dakotas. Before he reached his twenty-third birthday he was an independent farmer on a quarter-section of virgin land, which would certainly gain from five to ten thousand dollars in value by the time he was old. Now the young man must needs work on wages or as renter for fifteen or perhaps twenty years before he can "get ahead" enough to have a farm of his own. And he will be thirty-five or forty

THE SOCIAL TREND

years of age before he is where the other man was at twenty-three years of age.

So long as the fertile prairie beckoned him, the discontented American in the older States enjoyed an option—to move up or to move on. Now there is little for him to gain by moving on, and, since “Room at the top!” is the gospel for the exceptional man, it is hard to escape the conclusion that for the commonplace man the circle of opportunities has become relatively narrower. The superior man, however,—superior in ability, in education, in resources, or in connections—finding in the ceaseless progress of organization in our society a widening scope for the exercise of his superiority, more and more easily raises himself above the mass.

Since industrialism is, as it were, a wide-angled prism which refracts population more than does simple farming, it is likely that in days to come the social spectrum in America will be lengthened.

The slackening of expansion in the nineties was almost dramatic in its suddenness. In the five years ending 1884 the average annual enlargement of our food-bearing area was near 7,000,000 acres. In the five years following it

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

was less than 3,000,000 acres. In the succeeding ten years, 1889-99, it was 800,000 acres and would have been a minus quantity had not millions of acres of meadow lands been plowed up. Between 1860 and 1890 the median point of cereal production moved west about 120 miles a decade, whereas during the nineties it migrated only twenty-five miles. During the seventies the median point of improved farm acreage moved west 131 miles, during the eighties 107 miles, during the nineties only fifty-seven miles. During the nineties the center of population shifted west only fourteen miles, as against forty-eight miles in the eighties, fifty-eight in the seventies, and an average of fifty miles a decade during the first century of the republic.

How land values shot up as soon as the extension of the crop-bearing area slackened is clearly seen from the following census figures:

	1870-80	1880-90	1890-1900	1900-10
Per cent. increase in number of farms	50	14	26	11
Per cent. increase in farm acreage	31.5	16.3	35	5
Per cent. increase in improved farm				

THE SOCIAL TREND

	1870-80	1880-90	1890-1900	1900-10
acreage	50	25.6	16	15.4
Per cent. increase in value of farm property	36	32	27	100.5
Per cent. increase in value of farm land	37	30	26	118

Think of the aggregate farm land of the United States gaining 118 per cent. in value in a single decade!

§ 2

Had we been an ignorant peasant people the sudden ending of arable public land in the rain-belt would have brought us up sharply as if we had met a stone wall, and the blow to popular hopes and ideals would have been tragic. But, being ingenious and enterprising, our people, finding themselves unexpectedly at the end of the sunset path, at once pushed out laterally in quest of new margins and found various buffers to ease the shock. Means were found to make the country stretch to fit its growing population. The numerous New England "abandoned farms," which startled the public during the latter part of the eighties, were quietly reoccupied, and

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

many stretches of poor or heavy soil which the land-seeker had contemptuously passed by in the old days began to be turned to account. In the Middle West millions of acres of swamp and overflowed lands were diked and drained while a great cry went up that the Western rivers should be caught and turned upon the desert. Since reclamation could best be financed and directed from Washington, there was a rapid growth of the functions of the Federal Government in relation to the settlement of the remaining public domain.

The enthusiastic popular response to the idea of conserving our natural resources was another evidence that we were on a new tack. For twenty or even thirty years before President Roosevelt in 1906 united a number of kindred policies and launched them under the name of "conservation," certain government scientific bureaus as well as certain university geologists and economists had been denouncing our waste of Nature's stored wealth and prophesying of the dearth to come. The people paid little heed to such warnings until it had been borne in upon them that the agricultural frontier was gone forever. Within about ten years after the event it-

THE SOCIAL TREND

self, the public mind was ripe for the conservation idea.

The same state of mind lies behind the enormous expansion in the activities of the Department of Agriculture. A few inches below the surface of the American farm lies a second farm that is rarely tilled. Shallow plowing and scanty cultivation may do when a man is spreading himself out thin over a quarter-section; but when the farmer has to provide farms for his two boys out of that same quarter-section, he is glad to be shown how to get more from the soil. So long as there was a West to send boys to, he was content with the old simple tillage. I can remember how the Iowa farmers used to jeer at the professors in the State college of agriculture! "Them fellers with their book learnin' can't teach me nothin'," was how many a granger put it. Now the farmers themselves sit meekly at the feet of experts who explain to them seed-selection and scientific tillage, while the agricultural colleges are visited by hosts of young men keen to learn how to make farming pay.

The "back-to-the-land" agitation is the aftermath of the disappearance of the frontier. So

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

long as we were spreading over the boundless wilderness there was little chance to make money in agriculture. The Homestead Law, by which any one who would go to cultivating wild land got a farm as a gift, operated as a bounty on agriculture, and, of course, caused it to be overdone. No matter how ruinously low the price of farm produce sank, the plow went right on with its conquests, for the settler looked for his reward in the increase in the value of his homestead rather than in the proceeds from the sale of his crops. Continually fine old farms from Massachusetts to Indiana lost value because of the disastrous cheapening of their produce owing to the stimulated extension of grain-growing in the West.

Once the process had ended, the price of produce rose, and at last there was a chance to make a good living by putting brains, training, and money into farming instead of merely hard work. The back-to-the-land gospel is a recognition of the fact that to-day the young fellow who quits the farm for good may be turning his back on a better opportunity than he will ever find in the glittering city which beckons him.

Since reclamation and better farming fell far

THE SOCIAL TREND

short of making the soil stretch to our need, there began an exodus of Americans seeking in the Canadian Northwest that cheap land which was no longer to be had here. In the first decade of this century, we lost half a million to Canada, for the most part not jobless men seeking wages but farmers of the Middle West who had sold their holdings for from \$80 to \$125 an acre in order to obtain Saskatchewan land for their sons at \$20 an acre. For the first time in our history Americans in large numbers have bidden good-by forever to the Stars and Stripes because they no longer wave over free land.

But the margins taken together failed to retain for agriculture its old preëminence. Before 1900 we exported a third of our wheat crop: a decade later the proportion was about an eighth. America, which a generation ago was chief purveyor of fresh beef to the United Kingdom, began in 1914 to import ship-loads of chilled meat from Argentina. Meanwhile the swing of our people over into manufacturing—a shift greatly accelerated by a huge immigration—has quite reversed our rating of foreign markets. Thirty years ago we were intent on feeding Europeans and worried lest Germany

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

should exclude our pork. Now our interest is in the countries about the Pacific which may be induced to absorb our exports of manufactures. We are solicitous about the maintenance of the "open door" in the Orient and keen on breaking into South American trade.

§ 3

So long as there was a vacant Great West, it was rational to welcome the immigrant who would plant himself in the wilderness. Why should empty stretches which aliens would make blossom with the homes of men be reserved for coyote, prairie-dog, and rattlesnake?

But the immigrants of the last twenty-five years have generally failed to find a footing on the soil. In 1910 there was one Scandinavian farmer for every eight persons of Scandinavian birth in this country and one German farmer for every eleven persons of German birth; but it took 130 Poles, Hungarians, or Italians among us to furnish one farmer. Unable to engage in food-growing, most of the immigrants have had to press into the labor market, compete for jobs with those already here, and thereby create a sense of pressure which nourishes a rising

THE SOCIAL TREND

demand for the restriction of foreign immigration. It is safe to predict that the cheerful come-on-boys-there's-room-for-all attitude toward the congested peoples of the world will never again prevail in this country. We have paid a high tuition to learn the lesson which we might have had for nothing by studying the pages of Malthus and his successors.

§ 4

During the first decade of this century, while our population grew 21 per cent., the volume of the ten principal crops of the country increased only 9 per cent. No wonder the people feel themselves between the jaws of high cost of living, and look angrily about for some one to blame! During the eighteen years after 1896 the retail cost to Americans of their fifteen principal articles of food rose more than 70 per cent. Although this reflects a general upward movement due to the increasing plentifulness of gold, there is no doubt that, despite the gain of labor in productiveness during this period, there was actually a fall in real wages. The chief causes of this sinister phenomenon have been the exhaustion of our supply of virgin arable land

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

and an unprecedented volume of immigration. Every political leader offers his own explanation of the rise in the cost of living, and his own remedy. Few perceive that the old low level of food prices can be restored only by restoring to us a public domain like the one we have lost. While greater economy in distribution, the elimination of superfluous middlemen, and a brushing away of the leeches that tap the stream of food-stuffs at various points on its way from the farms to the larders may afford some relief, it is certain that never again will the American people know the higher foods to be so abundant and cheap as they were in the middle of the nineties, when under the stimulus of the homestead bounty agriculture had reached the limit of its facile expansion.¹

The trebling of farm lands in value, while it has converted millions of farm-owners into petty capitalists, and lightened the weight of mortgage indebtedness which was felt so acutely in the early nineties and which had much to do with nationalizing the demand for "free

¹ Our participation in the war brought a confusing shift of price levels. It is only in the period previous to 1917 that lines of fundamental tendency may be read from the course of prices.

THE SOCIAL TREND

silver," raises a formidable barrier to the ascent of the farm laborer. When I was a boy, no gray-haired man worked on a farm for wages unless he was drunkard or wastrel. So short and easy was the path to farm ownership that virtually all the farm "hands" were less than thirty-five years of age. With good land worth from \$100 to \$200 an acre, the climb is now far longer and harder, and many, lacking the requisite intelligence and character, will remain hired laborers or renters throughout life.

With greater permanency in the farm laborer class, its needs should be more considered and its lot made more tolerable. As it comes to include older persons, more provision should be made for married men with families. In time, no doubt, we shall see much farm help accommodated, as in the Old World, in detached cottages instead of eating at the farmer's table and sleeping in the garret. Even if henceforth fewer of them can look forward to eventual ownership, it does not follow that farm laborers need be objects of pity. Many pioneers shortened their lives with overwork and privation so that it is quite possible that a properly protected and organized farm laborer class may

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

enjoy more of the essentials of a rational human existence and see their children better educated than could the settlers of the American wilderness.

§ 5

With the frontier disappeared one of the greatest obstacles to the success of the labor movement in this country. On the Pacific Slope not infrequently one comes upon the bearer of a name that thirty or forty years ago sent a shiver down the spine of the Eastern employer. He may have been the organizer of an aborted labor-union, the leader of a strike that failed, or the stormy petrel of some fierce industrial strife. Often, too, one's host on ranch or fruit farm proves to be an intelligent Eastern working-man who foresaw what was coming and broke away while yet there was time. Not our last frontier alone, but the earlier frontiers as well, have afforded haven to the discontented spirits of the working class—the natural leaders who would have welded and wielded their class had they but stayed by it. Although to-day the employers continually draw up into their well-paid service many of the brightest men in the ranks

THE SOCIAL TREND

of labor, the greater stability and generalship of the labor movement in the last twenty years is due in part, no doubt, to the closing of the old outlet for insurgent and blacklisted working-men.

§ 6

Having skimmed the cream off the continent, having stripped the tenderloin of the quarry, we are undergoing a spiritual transformation like to that of a flush youth who, having run through his inheritance, finds himself forced to stoop for the first time to petty calculations and despised economies. Having scooped the luscious heart out of the watermelon we are now among the seeds, or even approaching the rind. A century and more of access to boundless natural wealth fostered in the social mind the conviction that for us all evils vanish in a larger good and that Divine Providence will see to it that Americans pay no serious penalty for their folly, negligence, or extravagance. If poor farming wore out the soil, there were limitless leagues beyond; if fire were allowed to ravage the forests, there were better forests further on; if the grafter stole the public revenues, the citi-

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

zens jested, for was there not enough prosperity to stand it? How often facts mocked the hard-won wisdom of our forefathers! In America somehow a "rolling stone" *did* "gather moss." "Waste not want not" was made a joke by mine-owners and lumber-men.

Moreover, optimism seemed justified by the irrepressible growth of the country. Every economic crisis was followed by a higher wave of prosperity. Normally cities, businesses, fortunes, land values, crop totals, incomes, changed in only one direction—*they grew*. Standstill or decline was an abnormal thing, in need of explanation. The "bull" temperaments tended in the long run to amass bigger fortunes than the "bear" temperaments. So often did the economic buoyancy of the country avert the natural recompense of error that the intelligent foreteller of such penalties was scoffed at as "croaker" and "calamity howler" and "pessimist." "Booms," frenzied speculation, overbuilding, overborrowing, overdoing of public improvements, overexpansion, overconfidence, and extravagance are among the fruits of the beaming optimism bred in us by access to huge stores of natural wealth. Now that the American peo-

THE SOCIAL TREND

ple are beginning to be squeezed in the vise of the law of diminishing returns, they are likely to gain something of the proverbial canniness and frugality of the Scot.

§ 7

Free land was an equalizer, for it admitted all comers to possession of the chief instrument of wealth production. At the frontier no man would work long for a farmer or pay rent when for next to nothing he could get other land just as good and farm it himself. The town artisan had to be paid a wage large enough to keep him from turning farmer. Moreover, such differences as there were in respect to economic condition did not put *distance* between people. In general, class distinctions show themselves, not between those who possess and those who do not possess, but between those who possess and those who not only *do not* but apparently *cannot* possess. Always in the West—whether the “West” was Ohio or Idaho—the rich banker has not objected to the penniless but capable young man calling on his daughter, because the banker had been penniless himself when he married, and because he knew that this young man would be as

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

well off as the banker now is when he had reached the same age. The abundance of opportunity of the frontier, coupled with equal access to these many opportunities, engendered a sense of social equality which gradually became part of "Americanism," and in the older States hindered the social consequences of economic stratification from glaringly showing themselves. Arthur Chapman covers the case in his poem, "Out Where the West Begins":

Out where the handclasp's a little stronger,
Out where the smile dwells a little longer,
That's where the West begins.
Out where the sun is a little brighter,
Where the snows that fall are a trifle whiter,
Where the bonds of home are a wee bit tighter,
That's where the West begins.

Out where the skies are a trifle bluer,
Out where friendship's a little truer,
That's where the West begins.
Out where a fresher breeze is blowing,
Where there's laughter in every streamlet flowing,
Where there's more of reaping and less of sowing,
That's where the West begins.

Out where the world is in the making,
Where fewer hearts in despair are aching,

THE SOCIAL TREND

That's where the West begins.
Where there's more of singing and less of sighing,
Where there's more of giving and less of buying,
And a man makes friends without half trying,
That's where the West begins.

§ 8

Again, the frontier has been a maker of political democracy in this country. In our early history there was a tendency toward class government and the growth of vested interests in the seaboard States where society was slipping into grooves. The younger States of the West, on the other hand, showed a strong tendency to sweep away the props of class rule. The States of the Ohio Valley introduced into our political practice the abolition of property qualifications for the suffrage, of property and religious qualifications for office-holding, the increase in the proportion of elective officials as compared with appointive officials, shorter terms of office, rotation in office, and the submitting of State constitutions for popular ratification. It stood for "State's rights" as against Federal authority, for State banks as against the Bank of the United States. From the West at different times has swept eastward Jeffersonian and Jacksonian De-

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

mocracy, Lincoln Republicanism, Grangerism, Populism, Bryanism, and Progressivism, together with such contemporary political innovations as direct primary, initiative, referendum, recall, and the popular election of United States Senators.

While the aggressive democratic spirit kindled in the zone of the most abounding and diffused opportunity has constantly spread back into the older communities and broken the spell upon them of old families, old wealth, and old prestige, it does not follow that with the ending of the frontier we shall begin to lose our democracy, even that we shall cease to become more democratic. To be sure, one of the mammæ of democracy is dried up. But, though the physical West passes, there is a spiritual West, such as has inspired the democratic movement in long-settled countries like France and Norway. From time to time there appear emancipating spirits who spurn man-made distinctions of place, rank, and money and whose hearts go out toward every man as toward a brother. Such are the poets and the prophets; such are the humanizing Isaiahs, Garrisons, Mazzinis, Victor Hugos, and Tolstois, who recall us to natural

THE SOCIAL TREND

fellowship, who impress us with our likenesses even when conditions are exaggerating differences, who level men at the very moment new social terraces are rising. Let no one leave out of the reckoning this spiritual West.

§ 9

Now that the frontier is gone, not so many of us will be able to drink deep of *personal liberty*. The pioneers were in thralldom to the swamps, the stumps, the shaggy wilderness, the wretched roads, the fevers, and the "varmints." They lacked music, art, books, refined society, good medical attention, the thousand conveniences, pleasures, and stimuli of the riper communities. But they were freer from the will of other men than the more comfortable denizens of the East. They were little burdened with government, law, public opinion, custom, and conventionality. They knew and enjoyed their freedom and it went to their heads, producing that intoxication which the West has always wrought on a certain type. Henceforth, the bold independent spirits who have been wont to find a satisfying freedom on the spacious frontier will have to endure the dwarfing pressures and accept the

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

painful standardizing of a complex social life without hope of escape, unless, indeed, they are able to climb up into the exhilarating zone of mastery where one is still an integer. As compensation the citizen can expect to be better protected, housed, warmed, clothed, nursed, schooled, informed, entertained, and edified than was the old-time American.

That domestic husbandry and the handicrafts are gone and nearly everybody lives by catering to others makes it imperative to conform to the wishes of these others. This has a good side in that the vicious man is obliged to become outwardly decent lest he lose employment, or patronage, or credit. The employer has been a mighty force for lessening intemperance. Sex irregularity has been obliged to become more furtive. The great improvement in manners is due in part to the power of firms and companies to exact politeness of their employees in dealing with the public. Sheer publicity is more anti-septic than ever before; but the dread of grave material damage if one takes the unpopular side or speaks out his mind against some intrenched evil is taking the backbone out of people at an alarming rate. The preacher knows he can be

THE SOCIAL TREND

struck through his wealthy pew-holders, the educator through his school board, the editor through his big advertisers, the officer of a company through his board of directors, the working-man through his boss. The lawyer fears to lose the corporation cases, the physician dreads the loss of his place on the faculty of the medical school, on the hospital staff, or on the board of health, the merchant is silent lest the banks shut off his credit, the manufacturer realizes how vulnerable he is to the ferreting reporter or the factory inspector. No one dares speak until others are speaking, move until others have led. After suffering awhile from ingrowing moral convictions, people *may reach the point of not having any strong moral convictions.*

Backwoods, prairie, and placer bred the go-it-alone spirit to which nothing was more galling than the taking of orders. Conversely mill, railroad and department-store teach hierarchy and obedience. But the autocratic and harsh discipline of these highly organized enterprises must be softened; for after having drunk so deeply of the sweet cup of individual liberty, the American will not endure the irksome collar of obedience unless he can feel, as does the public

DOING WITHOUT THE FRONTIER

school teacher or the college professor, that he bows not to the will of his immediate superior, but to the requirements inherent in all organization.

V

THE CHANGING DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

§ 1

AS a boy I lived for some time in the family of a pioneer uncle in Iowa. His log-cabin was a perfect fairyland for a child because of the fascinating industries carried on in it. Before the big open fireplace we passed many an autumn evening paring, quartering, and stringing apples and hanging them in festoons about the kitchen to dry. That was long before grocers began to purvey evaporated apples. Before the advent of winter great crocks of plum-butter and apple-butter were prepared, as well as jars of marmalade, kegs of pickles, and barrels of salt pork. In the smoke-house hams and bacon were curing, while in every corner of the cellar lay a pile of vegetables preserved under straw or dry earth. From the ashes in the great leach was drained the lye, which when boiled from time to time

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

with refuse fat in the huge iron kettle outdoors furnished "soft soap" for the use of all save guests. Not only were there quilting-frames and candle-molds, but discarded in the attic lay a card, a hackle, a spinning-wheel, and various other home-made implements, the use of which lay quite beyond the ken of a boy.

Now, at one time these industries were characteristic of most American households. Nearly all that was eaten and worn in the family had been manufactured by the hands of its women-folk. In those days nothing was heard as to the "economic dependence" of the wife, of her being "supported." My aunt, busy in and about the house, was as strong a prop of the family's prosperity as my uncle afield with his team. Uncle knew it, and, what is more, *she knew* he knew it.

Gradually, however, a silent revolution has taken place in the lot of the home-staying woman. The machine in the factory has been slipping invisible tentacles into the home and picking out, unobserved by us, this, that, and the other industrial process. The knitting-machine has taken the knitting; the power-driven sewing-machine, the making of garments. The oil-refinery molds candles for the household,

THE SOCIAL TREND

and the soap-manufacturer has made junk of lye leach and soap-kettle. The packing-house has made the smoke-house a relic, while the store-blanket has relegated the quilting-frame to the garret. The surplus milk goes to the creamery, so that the churn is becoming a curiosity. Canneries of all kinds crowd the grocer's shelves with preserved fruits and vegetables which formerly could be had only by the skill and care of the housewife. So, one by one, the operations shift from home to factory until the only parts of the housewife's work which remain unaffected are cooking, washing, cleaning, and the care of children.

It seems safe to say that *four fifths of the industrial processes carried on in the average American home in 1850 have departed never to return.* What has been done with the energy thus released?

It certainly has not been diverted to rearing a larger brood of children. The first census of the United States in 1790 showed that in the whole population there were nineteen white children under sixteen years of age for every ten white women more than sixteen years of age. In 1900 the census revealed that the children and

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

women in the white population were about equal in number.¹ This means that the average woman to-day has half as many children to look after as had her great-grandmother.

§ 2

One consequence of the shriveling of the household in economic importance is the great migration of daughters from the home where there is little for them to do to the factory, the laundry, the restaurant, the store, the office, and the class-room. At present there are in this country not far from eleven millions of women above sixteen years of age gainfully employed, and the proportion is rapidly growing. Between 1880 and 1910 the population of females above ten years of age who were at work for money rose from 14.7 per cent. to 22 per cent., and there is no reason to doubt that the proportion of women at work increased to the same extent. In 1900 one woman in every five was engaged in a gainful occupation; in 1910 nearly one out of every four was a gainful worker. The results of the 1920 census are not yet available but they will show the same trend. Women wage-earners

¹ See "A Century of Population Growth"; p. 105.

THE SOCIAL TREND

are increasing in number faster than men wage-earners and form an ever greater contingent in the great industrial army.

This swelling exodus out from the home into remunerative industry is not for a moment to be interpreted as a tendency for the wife to quit the domestic hearth. To be sure, in 1900 a third of all widows and more than half the divorced women were earning wages, but probably not one wife in fifteen is working outside her home. On the whole, wage-earning women are single women, and nearly half of these single women are less than twenty-six years of age.

Of these girl wage-earners it is pretty nearly safe to say that *four fifths of them will marry and five fifths think they will*. Here is the root of the reason why few of them fit themselves seriously for their work, take the pains to acquire skill, or organize in defense of their interests as earners. Why bother with such matters if in a year or two you are going to have a husband to take care of you?

§ 3

Consider, now, the married woman in the home. How is she affected by the passing of in-

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

dustrial processes from her little realm? The wife of the unskilled, poorly-paid wage-earner probably gets no gain at all from it. The husband's wage proving insufficient, now that nearly everything used in the household is bought, the wife takes a job in the factory or goes out to wash or scrub or sew, and home-life goes by the board. Or she adds to the family income by keeping boarders or by taking home work given out by warehouses or factories.

In general, the industrial home-work of the wife is so miserably paid that her economic value to the family may well be less than in the days when she made their food and clothing with her own hands. Before the war an investigation in Massachusetts showed that half the home-workers earned less than eight cents an hour and two thirds of them less than ten cents. Half of the home-workers on wearing-apparel earned less than seven cents an hour, while half of those producing paper goods at home received less than five cents an hour, i. e., far below a living wage.

The whittling away of household industry by the factory variously affects the wives of the better-paid, e. g., the skilled workers. Since

THE SOCIAL TREND

more and more the family consumes the boughten rather than the home-made, there is an increasing strain on the earnings of the husband. There is a growing need of more money in order to meet the requirements of the customary standard of living. So the wife *may* follow her disappearing work into the mill, asserting in pickle or biscuit factory, in cannery or millinery establishment, woman's immemorial concern with the production of food and clothing.

But if the earnings of the husband suffice, the wife continues in the home, occupying herself in satisfying wants of a higher character. Every time an invasion from the factory releases her from some old task, she sets about gratifying some higher want. She cleans and dusts and tidies as never before. She switches from making the useful to fabricating the ornamental—lambrequins, and curtains, and doilies, and fancy work. She becomes the provider of comforts rather than the provider of simple utilities, and takes it upon herself to minister as well as she can to the intellectual and esthetic needs of her family.

The next higher economic class, the women-folk of business and professional men, are those

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

who have experienced the greatest change in their lot. Since their husbands' income avails to purchase comforts and even luxuries as well as utilities, they are entirely absolved from *making* anything whatever. Able usually to install a menial in the kitchen, they find themselves possessed, after their children have emerged from infancy, of *a leisure such as has been throughout history the exclusive privilege of a small aristocracy.*

Visit the comfortable homes, and in nine cases out of ten you will find that the men are hard at it wresting a steady income from a competitive world. On the other hand, perhaps a third of the wives may be called leisured. Busy they may be, but they are busy doing what they please and not what they must. Among a people that boasts of fewer elegant idlers than any other well-to-do people in the world, the household springs of serious occupation have so dried up that it is a fact that married women are furnishing most of the membership of America's leisure class.

THE SOCIAL TREND

into their laps by the filling of the home with factory product?

Many, alas, knew nothing better to do with the priceless gift than to fritter it away in competitive ostentation, in feverish reciprocal entertainment, in the giving and receiving of empty attentions which they sought to dignify with the phrase "social duties."

Some, however, discovered a new rôle of the mother in respect to child culture, and dedicated their leisure to educating and training their children better than the school-teacher could do it. Others spent it in devotional exercises and church work, with apparently no other outward effect than to deepen in men the impression that religion is a matter for women. A large number, aware of a certain void in their lives, engaged in the pursuit of "culture." Of how this might be gained they had but the vaguest idea, but they divined that you must get far away from the present and the practical. So forty or forty-five years ago home-staying women began timidly to band together into self-improvement clubs, where they took turns in reading papers on Etruscan Art and Botticelli and Miracle-Plays,

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

cribbed too often, I fear, from the "Encyclopædia Britannica."

Timidly they came nearer—the Renaissance, Napoleon, Bismarck; Corot, Millet, Whistler; Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Montessori—until now there are actually hundreds of thousands of women absorbing the best books and lectures on sanitation, child-welfare, industrial diseases, domestic architecture, social centers, and housing-reform. It has come to the point that experts in community problems win an earlier and a fuller hearing from women than from men.

Nor have the women's clubs stopped here. The party "boss" got his grip on politics partly because the "good" citizens were too busy to watch what he was doing with his control. Now, the interesting thing about the women banded for the study of community concerns is that they have as much leisure as the boss himself. Their leaders are as able as he and it is impossible to "square" them, for they are obsessed with the idea that the true aim of politics is public welfare, not private profit. So the persistent civic curiosity of the women is play-

THE SOCIAL TREND

ing havoc with the system that the boss has "put over" the male voters. In the few years that they have been poking about, peering into the management of the county almshouse, the disposal of police-court cases, liquor-law enforcement, "red light" policy, the treatment of girl strikers, and other incidents of local government, the awesome veil has been rent, the mysteries of man-made politics have been exposed to the multitude, and male prestige has suffered a rude shock.

§ 5

Bear in mind, too, that, while the wives have been gaining leisure and the courage to put it to such incendiary use, their yoke-fellows are worse driven than ever. Competition in all lines is said to be keener, and the average merchant or newspaper man will assure you that the demon of Work chases him harder every year. Is it not notorious that out of deference to the Tired Business Man the drama has been nearly driven from the stage by the "girl show"? Now, what is going to happen when it is the wives who have the time to read Bergson and

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

Synge and Yeats; to become acquainted with the theories of Ferrero and Metchnikoff and Mendel; to learn the findings of Goddard and Healy and Havelock Ellis; to have interpreted for them the reports of the immigration commission, the child-welfare bureau, the industrial relations commission and other significant documents? Shall we not see the day when on election morning the business man will say to his wife: "Molly, you've had time to read and get wise to these things. Tell me, now, what *is* an executive budget?"

Considering, besides this portent, that three girls now graduate from high school for every two boys, that nearly two fifths of the college students and of the June crop of bachelors are young women, that four fifths of the teachers are women, and that trained women able to "make good" are found in increasing numbers in nearly all the professions, who can doubt that the influence of women both in the home and out of it is bound to grow and that the sexes are approaching an equality in the management of society and in the shaping of civilization?

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 6

But is the case really so simple as that? As the lot of the wife becomes easier, the working-girl more often regards marriage as a haven, a release from hard work, a life-long security won not by yoke-fellowship but by sheer favor. It is true that young women able and willing to do remunerative work feel quite independent of man's favor. But great numbers, lacking in efficiency or self-reliance, shrink from the thought of self-support. This type is more tolerant of male failings, vices, and bad habits. The rakish but eligible young man appears to meet with quite as much indulgence from nice girls as he did two generations ago.

Observe, too, how it is nowadays between husbands and wives. When with spinning, weaving, knitting, churning, pickling, curing, and preserving, the home was a workshop, the wife was not "supported" by her husband. He knew the value of her contribution and took her seriously, even if he did belittle her opinions on politics and theology. But, with the industrial decay of the home, it is more and more often the case that the husband "supports" his wife.

In the well-to-do homes—and it is chiefly here

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

that the status of women in general is determined—the wife has lost her economic footing. Apart from motherhood, her rôle is chiefly ornamental. The husband is the one who counts, whose strength must be conserved, who cannot afford to be sick. Of course, much emphasis is laid on the wife's maternal contribution. But, aside from the one wife in six who rears no child, will wives feel and be able to persuade men that the bearing and rearing of three or four children offsets forty or fifty years of maintenance? Grandmother bore on the average six or eight children besides performing a hundred tasks which never present themselves in the modern household.

It is a cherished bit of make-believe that the husband is compensated by his wife's graces, her accomplishments, her culture, her social and public activities; that the "companionship" of so fine a creature is an equivalent for all she costs. But will nothing of patronage creep into the attitude of the bread-winner toward his unproductive mate? Having given up the rôle of busy Martha, is it not up to her to assume the rôle of the adoring Mary?

How will the case appear in the eyes of the

THE SOCIAL TREND

wife? As the woman of leisure realizes that everything she eats, wears, enjoys, and gives away comes out of her husband's earnings, her rising impulse to assert herself as his equal is damped by consciousness of her abject economic dependence. She is tempted to pay for support with subservience, to mold her manner and her personality to his liking, to make up to him by her grace and charm for her exemption from work. This "being agreeable" means often that she must subordinate her individuality, hide her divergent wishes and opinions or adopt his. But this sort of thing dwarfs the woman, spoils the man, and revives just the thing we fancied was dead for ever, i. e., *male ascendancy*.

So, although the surface current seems to be bearing women toward full equality with men, there is an undercurrent which runs in the other direction. Eleven million girls and women are outside the home slowly becoming valuable factors in the working world. But within the home are more than twice as many wives, most of them constantly losing in economic significance. Will they emerge from their shelter ere long and find a way of reconnecting themselves with productive labor, or will more and more of them

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

become passengers on a ship worked by the other sex? Certainly the cumulative effect of numerous small inconspicuous changes has brought women into a crisis on which turns the future of the relation of their sex to society and civilization.

§ 7

Alarmists scent danger in the opening of occupations to women, especially the better-paid ones, such as the professions. They fear lest so many of them will prefer financial independence to domesticity that the marrying contingent will be lowered below the danger-point. It is certainly true that not more than a quarter of each generation of women may turn their backs upon motherhood if the continuance of the race is to be assured. Nor is it less true that the remunerative job relieves young women of that stern necessity of attracting a mate which confronted girls in the days of our forefathers, when a husband was the sole "meal-ticket" in sight.

It ought to be borne in mind, however, that if spinsterhood is becoming more attractive on the economic side, the same is true of wifedom. Every year a proposal of marriage comes a little

THE SOCIAL TREND

nearer to being an offer of lifelong support. Every year, among the people in middling circumstances and above, the lot of the married woman is a little easier. The working-women who are so well off as not to covet marriage on good terms are, indeed, few in number. The overwhelming majority are unskilled and poorly paid, so that self-support in no wise turns them from marriage, although it does cause them to be less in a hurry about it.

§ 8

So much is said of women in the professions, "bachelor maids," the higher cost of the married state, and the postponement of marriage that it comes as a shock to discover that in point of fact Americans are one of the most married peoples on the face of the earth. More of us are wedded than in any country in Europe west of Hungary. The Magyars and the Slavs are the only Europeans who give themselves up to matrimony with greater abandon than we do.

Moreover, there is nothing to show that we are losing our unusual fondness for the married state. Out of a hundred American women in 1890, thirty-two were single; in 1900, thirty-one;

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

in 1910, only thirty. Nor are women passing into wifehood later than formerly. Of girls between fifteen and twenty-four years of age half were married in 1910 as against 47 per cent. twenty years earlier.

In order to make this encouraging showing, it is not at all necessary to count in our huge element of early-marrying East Europeans. Take the girls of American parentage; in 1890 just about half of them were married, in 1910 nearly 52 per cent. had stood before the altar. After all the "to do" lest young women lured by chances of well-paid work turn their faces away from marriage, it is rather startling to find that all that has happened is that one or two women out of a hundred who, two decades ago, would sooner or later have become wives, now never marry at all. The persistent spinsters have come to the point of constituting seven or eight out of every hundred women—certainly no very alarming proportion; while women who *do* marry are marrying earlier.

Some persons would have us believe that the latitude of divorce tolerated among us, whereby one marriage in ten is terminated in a court, is a foe of matrimony. The fact is that, if any-

THE SOCIAL TREND

thing, it contributes to make marriage popular. The more matrimony is seen to be a trap from which you can never release yourself once the door has snapped to, the shyer will you be of entering it. Certainly the peoples that are denied all reasonable relief for conjugal unhappiness—for example, the South Americans—are just the ones with the least inclination to marry and with the greatest illegitimacy.

§ 9

Many imagine that women were never so feminine as when the sex was restricted to the home, and dread lest contact with non-domestic pursuits is having a masculinizing effect upon them. In truth, the tendency ought to be precisely the reverse. If anything, women are coming to be oversexed. Formerly everywhere, and even to-day in most humanity outside of western Europe and the United States, the proportion of women who might reject motherhood was so small as to be negligible. Women married whether or not they felt or inspired love. There was no other mode of life open to them. Only in the home was there a place for them. But, now that it is easy and safe for a woman to earn her bread,

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

and now that in almost any walk of life she can go about without the male protector at her side, there is a refusal of matrimony not only by those with a gift, a call, or a cause, but also by those *who lack the instinct for mating and children*. Women of a certain neuter or even masculine endowment are now for the first time withholding their heredity from the stream of life. This means that each generation of women will be the daughters of the more feminine members of the previous generation. If, therefore, the rejection of marriage and motherhood by one woman in a dozen has any racial effect, it ought to make the female sex in the course of time more thoroughly feminine in its instincts. Whether this confinement of motherhood to the more feminine women will affect the psychic endowment of their sons as well as their daughters is a very interesting query.

§ 10

If ever the number of young women who prefer self-support with independence to marriage becomes so large as to imperil race continuance, it does not follow that society should close to women the doors that admit to the higher kinds

THE SOCIAL TREND

of work, should immure the handicapped sex again in the conventional "woman's sphere" from which they have so recently escaped. It would be fairer and quite as effective for society to *make matrimony more attractive*.

One means would be to lift the ban on the woman's staying with her job after marriage. At present the couple are intimidated by the sneering comment: "She's married a man who is n't equal to supporting his wife." With the decreasing importance of women's labor in the home, there is greater need of money income. The sacrifice involved in two salaried persons undertaking to live on the salary of one deters both men and women from marriage until the man has attained the point of being able to meet the situation single-handed. The social convention against the wife earning outside the home may encourage children but it undoubtedly discourages matrimony.

The throttling of alcoholism is another pro-marriage policy. Liquor has been man's poison, not woman's; and until lately a serious proportion of young men were barred from consideration by a sensible working-girl because of their habits. Is it rash to estimate that at least 15 or

DOMESTIC POSITION OF WOMEN

20 per cent. of sought young women who remained single did so because of dread of becoming the wife of a drinker?

Long before throwing more difficulties in the way of women following or fitting themselves to follow the higher callings, the true friend of the home will recognize that if desirable women remain single not all the fault may lie with them. Men may be loath as well as women. What must be the bearing on this point of the commercialized prostitution that has been allowed to spread in nearly all our cities? Can any one doubt that a traffic providing men with a cheap and irresponsible indulgence of their sex appetite is the deadliest foe of the orderly sex relation that has ever appeared? At all ages the proportion of married persons is smaller in city than in country and one cause is the access of city men to this loathsome market. Not until society has throttled these twin cobras, the liquor traffic and the social evil, will it be entitled to cast a doubtful eye upon the attitude of successful working-women toward matrimony.

VI

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD ¹

§ 1

WHO feed the current of ideas in which our minds live and move like fishes in a stream? Why, chiefly the clergy, the educators, the newspaper men, the lawyers, and the judges. Few of us have opinions which have not been formed upon ideas conveyed to us through these groups. Now, although women are a half of all folks, it is a striking fact that very few of them are members of these groups. Small, indeed, is their part in handing on directly to adults the treasures of culture.

How many of the sermons preached from our pulpits last Sunday came from a woman's mind? About one in 171. And newspaper editorials? Certainly not more than one in thirty. And lectures in colleges and universities? Perhaps one in fifteen. Of the arguments before

¹ Courtesy of "The Delineator."

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

the courts only one in 190 is made by a woman.

And as for decisions from the bench—which fix the basic relations among us,—why, all of them come from male judges.

So, for all our admitting girls to the colleges and women to the professions, it is safe to say that *nine tenths* of the river of ideas in which our minds are bathed flows out from the lips and pens of *men*. A century ago, no doubt, the diffusing of culture was still more a sex monopoly. Then, perhaps, 95 per cent. of opinion-making ideas reached the public through men's minds. And in Shakspeare's day it may have been 98 per cent. In fact, ever since the learned professions arose, this has been pretty nearly "a man-made world," to use Mrs. Gilman's happy phrase.

Nor is there much prospect of its being anything else—anyhow not just yet.

Take the hundred brightest boys your county produces. There is nothing to hinder their going in for leadership if they choose to. But the hundred brightest girls? Every one realizes that, if *they* go to the pulpit, the desk, the sanctum, the bar, and the bench, our race will run to scrubs. It will never do for *all* moth-

THE SOCIAL TREND

ers to be second-raters. If more than a quarter of the brightest girls turn away from marriage and motherhood, society may well take alarm. In the long run, the gifted women are of more value to society as mothers than as celibate preachers and teachers and editors. And, since the rearing of a real family—say, four children—consumes from sixteen to twenty of a woman's best years, how can the gifted women share equally with the gifted men in the leadership of society? Not that the men will always utter nine tenths of all that counts, as now; but shall we ever see the time when they contribute less than three quarters?

§ 2

Is it hard on women that this is so nearly a man-made world? Not if mind is sexless. But as everybody realizes, there *is* sex in mind. If men had to live in a world in which nine tenths of the sermons, lectures, editorials, court arguments, and judicial decisions emanated from women, would n't they become a bit restive? See how the high school lad frets when all his teachers are women. Mark how men rage when female disapproval threatens any of their pas-

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

times and pleasures. Is it then not likely that women find themselves in a misfit world? Is man-made culture any more congenial to normal women than a culture worked out chiefly by and for women would be congenial to normal men?

Sex in intellect? No, but there is sex in *instinct*. For purposes of her own nature gave the male an extra dose of *pugnacity*. Have you ever noticed how boys take to sports in which you *hit* something with fist, or foot, or bat, or mallet, or cue, or racket, or marble, or bullet? The *thwack* appeases the male's latent pugnacity. There is a mighty throb of joy, an exquisite moment, when the foot strikes the pigskin, or the bat meets the ball, or your alley sends flying the other fellow's marble. The "game" fish is one that "strikes" and "fights," so that the sportsman thrills with ecstasy. Girls at play, on the other hand, do not care much for the thwack. They like to toss or catch the ball rather than bat it. They love dancing and skipping the rope and games of chasing and being chased.

The reason man carries cane or stick, while the woman does not, is that the stick "comforts his innate ferocity," as Veblen suggests. In his

THE SOCIAL TREND

way of grasping and brandishing it one can see that his subconscious self is rapping the head of an imaginary enemy. The angry man is impelled to assault the person of his enemy. The angry woman assails his ego with stinging epithet or biting remark. The clash between women is *more psychic and less animal* than that between their men folk.

The *instinct to conserve life*—another's as well as one's own—is stronger in the female. The male, of course, reacts vigorously to attack, for this rouses his fighting spirit; but he is less heedful than the female of insidious danger calling for caution and care.

Any doctor will tell you women patients obey his injunctions better than male patients. In the "camps" of our Far West the miners generally were foolhardy in handling explosives and sinking shafts until they acquired wives. It was then not long before they began to behave as if life and limb were worth taking trouble about.

The world over, men are more reckless in their pleasures than women. While traveling in the interior of China in 1910, I inquired in each locality as to the prevalence of opium-smoking.

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

In every case the men had succumbed to the vice far more than the women. Among us there has been a like difference between the sexes in the use of strong drink. Nowhere has the intemperance of women come within hailing distance of that of their men. But in China I observed this queer thing; in the worst districts the women were not so far behind the men in opium-smoking as elsewhere. The same is true of alcoholism. In the alcoholized slums of London and Glasgow many women tope. It seems that when a vice so overpowers the men that it consumes their earnings and manhood, their women, abandoning their instinctive caution, resort to the bowl or the pipe in order to forget their anguish. What a pathetic token of despair!

Years ago in a Wyoming saloon—one of the sociologist's perquisites is the right to go anywhere in the name of "social investigation"—I observed a slight cow-boy, who had earned \$18 in a month of "riding herd," playing by himself at the faro-table. In half an hour, with no compensating excitement, he had lost to the dealer half his month's pay. This set me to wondering whether women do such foolish things. Since then I have asked at least half a hundred per-

THE SOCIAL TREND

sons, "Have you ever known a working-woman to gamble away her wages?" So far I have not had an affirmative answer.

In October, 1917, a Cossack officer with his company boarded our train in the Caucasus. In the evening he got hold of some "home-brew" at a way-station and presently he was gloriously drunk and trying to eject us all from the coupé. Now, at a time when Russian soldiers were hoisting unpopular officers on their bayonets, it was almost suicidal for this officer to make a beast of himself before his men. Yet he swallowed the liquor knowing perfectly well what it would do to him!

Weeks later I saw a crowd of natives gazing curiously at a man lying in the gutter of a street in Samarkand. It was a Russian officer dead drunk. When he put the enemy into his mouth to steal away his brains he well knew what madness it was at this critical moment to lower the prestige of his uniform in the eyes of the natives. But he could not control his hankering.

§ 3

No doubt the craving for fire-water and the love of gaming are as strong in one sex as in

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

the other. If less often women let it run away with them must we not conclude that women have more self-control? Of course we men try to dodge this unpalatable inference by pretending that woman's hankerings are weak.

Woman is the lesser man and all thy passions matched
with mine
Are as moonlight unto sunlight: and as water unto
wine.

But they can't put over this fiction because women show grip on themselves *all along the line*. Wherever I have gone I have found the women doing their duty, *as they saw it*, better than the men were doing *their* duty.

Would any one hold that the Japanese men are on as high a moral plane as the Japanese women? Do Chinese women come as short of their duty as Chinese men? Among the *cholos* of tropical South America I found that in the typical instance it was the *woman* who toiled and saved and somehow brought up her children; while the father, lazy and self-indulgent and unreliable, did little to support his family. And where, the world over, will you find husbands living up to their marriage-vows as faithfully on

THE SOCIAL TREND

the whole as wives? With us Americans the moral interval between the sexes is rather less than elsewhere, not because our women are less good, but because our men more nearly come up to the demands of their ideals.

No fair-minded man will charge the other sex with special responsibility for the existence of prostitution. The social evil uses women but exists for men. The demand, being much wider, discredits the male sex much more than the supply discredits the female sex. Moreover, two fifths or more of the prostitutes are weak-minded, and when one deducts from the remainder those who have been entrapped and those who have been driven by want, the number of fallen women who follow their loathsome profession out of liking must be small indeed.

What folly do we find among women to match men's addiction to vice? Fashion? But is fashion the product of feminine demand as saloon and brothel are products of masculine demand? Fashion grows out of a demand for decoration which, in turn, springs from the competition of women for marriage. Among us at present the female bears the burden of decoration which in the lower species is borne by the male. Man

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

does not need antlers, comb, wattles, ruff, crest, or plumes *because he offers his mate support*. The wife has come to be economically dependent upon her husband—in most cases,—and hence there has sprung up among women an exaggerated competition in decoration which is incidental to securing a supporting mate.

Which sex is responsible for the foot-binding that crippled the women of China? At first glance you blame the mothers who bind the confining bandages upon the feet of their little daughters. But why does the mother inflict such torture upon her own flesh and blood? Because without the “golden lily” foot the daughter will not be sought in marriage. And are the lads of China so silly as to consider only the girl’s foot? No, the taste of the lads has nothing to do with determining which girls shall be sought in marriage. It is the *fathers* that choose the brides. Thus it develops that this terrible cross—the heaviest that has ever been laid on women in a state of civilization—has been laid on the girlhood of China by the denatured taste of middle-aged fathers, each bound that his son shall have as modish a wife as the next one!

THE SOCIAL TREND

Although worked out chiefly by and for men, our contemporary culture professes to be rational, and women are expected to accept it and help hand it on. When women revolt at certain features of it, their protest is regarded as merely the reaction of feeling against reason. But if we examine this man-wrought culture with a critical eye, it appears that much of it rests on instinctive unreasoned masculine preference. Let us probe it at a few points.

§ 4

When the ordinary man is withstood or disobeyed by some one within his power, the "old Adam" surges up in his breast. He clenches his teeth and mutters to himself, "I'll show ye!" This is why the history of the treatment of the offender is so dismal—even downright sickening. Ever at the shoulder of the men who deal with him—lawmaker, judge, prosecutor, and, especially, the jailer or warden—have hovered the he-instincts, calling for *pain*, ever more *pain*, in subduing the recalcitrant. And all the ugly, cruel things prompted by male anger and vindictiveness—bastinado, cat-o'-nine-tails, keel-hauling, solitary confinement, silence, the "black

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

hole"—men have, at one time or another, draped in shining white and bidden mankind bow down to as "Justice"! But now women, some of them very clever at managing big unruly males, are scrutinizing the penal system we men have set up. Will they be fooled by this "Justice" bluff?

It is not straight punishment we have to blush for so much as the stupid brutality in dealing with incarcerated men. Consider how the capable contriving school-ma'am keeps in order her headstrong mischievous boys. Does she rely on just the smart of the rod? Not she. There are many weapons in her armory—argument, appeal, example, sarcasm, humor, rivalry—so that by one means or another she controls the bad boy without much use of the whip. Can you imagine such a woman running a penitentiary without exhibiting a like resourcefulness in overcoming opposition? If the women we shall presently see on penal boards and commissions will trust their own good sense when they come to consider our prisons, and not swallow all that the men tell them, there will eventually be more *management* in them and less *punishment*.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 5

As soon as the democratic movement of about a century ago bestowed the ballot upon masses of raw, instinctive American men, their crude pugnacity began to pervert politics into mimic warfare. The citizens went asunder into two camps—the political parties,—each of which developed a groundless hostility to the other. Political discussion borrowed from fighting such words as “campaign,” “battle,” “the enemy,” “chief,” “slogan,” and “banner.” It imported military features such as uniforms, marching companies, and torchlight processions. “Rallies” were held as the Indians held war-dances—to get up fighting steam. Success at the polls was celebrated in the spirit of the triumphant game-cock. The winning party called it a “victory,” argued that “To the victors belong the spoils,” and thereupon proceeded to convert the public officers into party assets.

Thus out of militarized politics was born that foul thing the “spoils system” which for more than half a century disgraced American democracy and, the world over, gave popular government a black eye. When I was a student in Germany thirty-four years ago, it was our de-

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

based politics that was oftenest offered as a justification for keeping the Hohenzollerns. So that in a way our "spoils system" made possible the World War.

Male intelligence finally cut away the ugly growth, but still our man-managed politics retains the blare and clash dear to the heart of juveniles. Now that women vote, the men who run politics want to lure them into the parties as now constituted, make thick-and-thin partisans of them, and pervert thoughtful female citizens into excited screeching, flag-waving viragos. They will have vehement female Republicans or vehement female Democrats on the party committees, but the male politicians have not the slightest intention of surrendering the reins. Still less do they intend to give any recognition to the critical party-lukewarm women who want to know what all this political hullabaloo and pothor is about.

The women will help demasculinize our politics if they hold aloof from political ghost-dancing, form their own non-partisan voters' organizations, and cultivate in their ranks the civic rather than the party spirit. Instead of allowing themselves to be herded and tagged, let them

THE SOCIAL TREND

stand apart and incalculable, and the parties will come to them. If, on the other hand, they throw themselves into politics as into a game, they will actually corrupt politics, for on account of their fair-play sense being less developed than men's they will be trickier and more crooked.

§ 6

Looked at philosophically, business is simply the social system of making and distributing goods. It exists to serve the public, but society allows individuals to make money in business because not otherwise can it obtain their services. That the claims of these profit-seekers should actually take precedence over life and limb, over health and morality, is preposterous. Yet good men, who are not in the least financially interested, oppose us when we try to get the children out of the factory into the school, abolish night work for women, make factory conditions such that the health of working-girls will not suffer, pull down unsanitary tenement-houses, and require vessels to carry enough life-boats and seamen to save the passengers in case of disaster.

The reason is that their susceptible instinct for

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

fighting has led the less thoughtful men to misconceive business as they have misconceived politics. They have come to look upon it as a prize-ring, where men battle one another for fortunes. It is a pity that in these fights some of the innocent public get hurt, but it can't be helped. It won't do to spoil the match. To check the sale of diseased meat, or "doctored" canned goods, or "salted" mines, or spurious oil-stock, or watered securities, or town lots under Lake Michigan; to curb peonage, or cornering, or combining, or rebating, or espionage, or blacklisting, would be like depriving the prize-fighter of his shrewdest blows, his cleverest tricks. So, obsessed by this "arena" or "great game" idea of business, numbers of humane and well-disposed men rush to the aid of business when it seeks to evade salutary regulation in the public interest.

Of themselves, women do not arrive at this false conception. Their eyes are clear enough to see that *business exists in order to serve the public*, that money-making by business men is not its primary aim. In their simplicity of heart, the poor things insist that the palming off of putridity and poison in the guise of food upon mothers in quest of nourishment for the children they

THE SOCIAL TREND

have risked their lives to bring into the world is not *business* at all but *sheer villainy!*

To curry favor with advertisers, actual and potential, thousands of newspapers and periodicals over our country are substituting the false prize-ring idea of business—with immunity of business men from “interference”—for the public-service idea. If, in the face of this vast poisonous propaganda, woman clings to her own sound idea of business, it will be because she confides in her common sense and will not let men fool her.

§ 7

Armament competition, militarism, and war are diseased growths springing chiefly from the masculine instincts of domination, pugnacity, and destruction. They are no more implied in the coexistence of states than “pistol-toting” and dueling are implied in the coexistence of individuals. It is chiefly because men run them that states, when they are crossed, bristle up like wild boars. Women do not resort to bloodshed to settle their disputes, and states would not do so if they reflected woman’s bent.

The fact that some of the worst chauvinists

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

and force-worshipers are women, that in belligerent nations women are among the most obstinate “die-hards” and haters, does not prove woman bellicose by nature. It proves simply that she can be duped. By making out the war to be “defensive” and representing the enemy as aiming to destroy her sons and her home, the wily militarists arouse and enlist woman’s maternal and life-conserving instincts.

No, in faith, it is the men that must bear the blame for war. Until their minds are drugged with falsehoods women see wholesale homicide for what it is. When right after the worst self-inflicted calamity that has ever befallen the white race, one hears bull-necked militarists detail with calmness—nay, even with professional zest—what “we” will do to our enemy in the “next war”—*ignoring always what the enemy will be doing then to us*,—one is tempted to let the women take entire charge in the hope that they would put these ultra-hes where they belong—in the mad-house!

During the age-long struggle to extend the reign of law, the ultra-hes ruffled up at every suggestion of arbitrating private disputes or submitting them to a tribunal. The courts

THE SOCIAL TREND

have cut the combs of these game-cocks, but it is just the same spirit, inter-reflected among millions of males, that gives us the haughty defiant state, willing to enter a bout of mass slaughter rather than yield a point. It is to be hoped that the new women citizens in all lands, rejecting the homicidal traditions of the he-state, will impart to the government something of their own reasonable and pacific disposition.

§ 8

Many of the religions bear the stamp "man made." The Mohammedan heaven with its bands of houris to solace the faithful is obviously by and for a man. Valhalla—the Norse heaven—where warriors fight all day and was-sail all night, must have been born in the imagination of the male. What attraction would it have for a pious woman? Note, too, how for thousands of years the deity has been "He." Surely it is as easy to think of ourselves as offspring of a divine Mother as of a divine Father! In fact, through the ancient mother-descent period the deities were mostly goddesses. There is a queer old Babylonian inscription in which we catch the deity changing sex, for in the upper

WOMEN IN A MAN-MADE WORLD

part of it the pronoun is "She" and in the lower part "He."

Christianity started without sex bias and appealed as much to one sex as to the other. It is no more a "he" religion than a "she" religion. It is just "human," and that is one cause of its success. But men got it under their control and masculinized it so far as they could. They allowed no women to be priest or prelate, stressed the hell-fire (fear) motive as women would never have done, and let it be overgrown by a life-hating asceticism, which woman's instincts tell her is sheer nonsense.

§ 9

Women may vote, but if the men direct the thinking behind their votes, men will rule society as heretofore. To free their minds women should do two things:

First, they should get by themselves and try to arrive at a point of view of their own regarding social questions. If intelligent developed women on exchanging views find that a certain man-made institution or doctrine grates upon their natures or revolts them, they may well become suspicious of it. Let them heed the hints

THE SOCIAL TREND

of their womanly intuitions and instincts.

Second, instead of accepting uncritically what the other sex hands them, women should endeavor to drill down to fundamentals. Let them hear what impartial sexless science has to say. Even if they *are* men, the spokesmen of science will not impose on them the product of sex-biased thinking. The economists will not teach the prize-ring idea of business, the political scientists will not recommend militarized politics, the penologists will not advocate terroristic treatment of the offender. By harking back to first principles instead of falling in with current masculine conventions, women will save themselves from being puppet voters pulled by strings in the hands of men.

VII

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS ¹

§ 1

IF there is one thing on which all men have at all times agreed, it is the beauty and excellence of philanthropy. In the days before the common people had gained control, government made no effort to relieve human suffering, and the resources for its alleviation had to be coaxed out of private hands. To the ministers of relief the generous giver seemed a saint, and so the tradition grew up that it is unbecoming to "look a gift horse in the mouth."

Inevitably the gratitude and admiration which the public feels for benevolence is taken advantage of by those seeking to ingratiate themselves with their fellow-citizens. It has long been recognized by the sponsors for charitable enterprises that the candidate for public office

¹ Courtesy of "The Atlantic Monthly."

THE SOCIAL TREND

offers an easy mark for the collector. The popularity-hunter has always appreciated the wisdom of subscribing handsomely to benevolent enterprises. Infamous businesses have sought to insure tolerance for their nefarious operations by giving heavily and conspicuously to charities with a strong sentimental appeal. Liquor-dealers and proprietors of gambling-houses and keepers of low resorts have been prompt with big contributions for the relief of visible dramatic suffering, such as the hunger or cold of women and children.

In the bad old days of bank failures, the capitalist who had slipped out of the back door of a bank with a satchel of loot, while the tricked depositors were yammering in vain at the front entrance, sought to turn aside public odium and win his way back to respectability by a consistent course of diplomatic and ostentatious giving. Public utility companies have often made a point of subscribing to charitable and civic undertakings, and their generosity has fluctuated pretty closely with the imminence of attack upon their privileges and their policies.

The resort to philanthropy as a means of propitiation becomes more general as the public be-

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

comes more and more critical of the ways of business. A dozen years ago it was often predicted that "muck-raking" would so wound, exasperate, and alienate the rich that the fountains of benevolence would dry up. Exactly the opposite has occurred. Exposure has had a wonderful effect in loosening the purse-strings of the exposed and exposable. As the impertinent question, "Where did he get it?" becomes more insistent, and busybodies with lanterns go poking and peering about the foundations of majestic fortunes, the rush to philanthropic cover becomes ever more noticeable.

All the gifts by which wrong-doers contrive to cover their nakedness with the mantle of respectability cost society more than they are worth. They are virtually purchases of unmerited leniency with money, and tend to break down the moral law just as compounding a felony breaks down the criminal law. It would be well if gifts of ill-gotten wealth were cast back into the teeth of the giver until he gave evidence of repentance and restitution. But, from the nature of the case, a compromising donation almost never meets with such a reception. It is a gift to a particular charity—a babies' fresh-air fund, a

THE SOCIAL TREND

newsboys' home, or a rescue mission. The directors of the charity have this work at heart and naturally feel that the Spartan-like rejection of a large and much-needed contribution would be tantamount to engaging in moral sanitation at the expense of the babies or newsboys or Magdalens. Each charity, therefore, is under a strong inducement to stick to its own task, take thankfully whatever money comes to it for its work, and refrain from facing broad questions as to the relation between modes of wealth-getting and the social welfare.

This is the reason why *private unendowed charities must, on the whole, be listed among the static rather than the dynamic forces in society*. They have every temptation to center their attention on their own bit of blessed work and to take the world as they find it. Why should they entertain questionings that might oblige them to discriminate between donations? What welcome will they have for ideas which are likely to offend or alarm their donors? Have they not every inducement to regard the class of poor whom they serve, and the class of rich who provide them with the means of serving the poor, as natural and fixed features in the social

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

system? So we have the anomaly that groups of people who have a very wide knowledge of special conditions, and who have acquired precious experience in particular lines of social service, have little to say when projects of social reconstruction are brought upon the carpet. Not only do many of them hold aloof from constructive social reformers, but often they throw cold water on proposed remedies and policies which are in successful operation elsewhere.

There is another and a greater limitation upon private philanthropy. Of late we have dropped the old, simple, soothing explanation of the cause of human misery. Nowadays we know too much about distress to dismiss it as merely the result of unfitness for the struggle for existence. We have learned that people struggle, not in still water, but in an agitated medium full of up-currents and down-currents; that poor swimmers may be borne up and good swimmers may be carried down. A quarter of a century ago social workers took to investigating seriously the head-waters of the endless flow of miserable people defiling before them. They have traced up the tributaries of this flood, and, instead of finding their sources to be *individual*

THE SOCIAL TREND

congenital defects, they have found many of them to be *adverse social conditions*. This being true, the really big thing to do is not just to handle the current of dependents as it flows past, but to get at the sources and find a way of plugging them up. Nature cannot be changed—save by the slow methods of eugenics,—congenital weakness cannot be cured, but an adverse social condition admits of its being removed.

Some of these conditions can be removed without disturbing anybody much, unless it be the taxpayer. Such are city congestion, or convivial social customs, or truancy, or lack of recreation facilities. But most of the adverse social conditions are mixed up with some lucrative business, and you cannot go about to abolish them without having a business interest on your back. The social conditions which create down-currents are usually *conditions of work* or *conditions of living*—including under this latter, housing, food, and recreation. Now, the caterers to vice who seize upon, pervert, and exploit the instinct of young people for pleasure, have been pretty well outlawed, and there is no danger lest social workers be embarrassed by donations from *that* quarter.

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

Few, indeed, are the legitimate charities which have been brought under any obligation to the liquor traffic, gambling, the social evil, or the commercialized theater. Only a few years ago, however, very respectable donors were protesting against raising the question of the housing of the working-class population. Happily, the movement for the betterment of housing is now so far advanced that it has become disgraceful knowingly to draw rentals from rotten and disease-breeding tenement-houses. People who care to be respected have bowed to the requirements of the housing laws or else shifted their investments to other kinds of property. This leaves the real fight to center around the questions of *the conditions and pay of labor*.

Now, there are few fortunes which do not rest on businesses that are more or less sensitive to such questions. The proposition that the conditions of labor need amendment if we are going to lessen very much the flow of misery and degradation, is a terrible shock to the whole policy of reliance on private philanthropy. Few indeed are the administrators of unendowed philanthropies who can advance many steps along this path without barking their shins.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 2

In Pennsylvania steel towns the Young Men's Christian Association has been quite inert with respect to any problem of the steel-workers which involves their relations to the company—such as the effects of the seven-day week, the twelve-hour day, the all-night shift, the twenty-four-hour turn every other week, or the preventable work accidents—for the reason that much of the money that runs it comes from the officers and superintendents of the mills.

To be sure, the association inspires young men to lead a cleaner life, but what in mill towns is this problem compared with the problem of conditions of work? I talked once with an association secretary about conditions in the West Virginia coal-field. In one district where he has a strong work, the company owns 35,000 acres of land,—everything except the right-of-way of the railroad through that district. The moment one leaves the right-of-way, the company may treat him as a trespasser. If an investigator goes there without company authorization he may be treated as a trespasser the moment that he steps from the depot platform; if a labor

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

organizer goes in there, the company can order him out of the house of any employee; a missionary going in there must have a company permit. Moreover, a band of company sluggers, known as the "wrecking crew," takes in hand any agitator or organizer who comes in, and beats him up so that he cannot proceed with his purpose.

I asked the association secretary what he thought of this feudalism. He replied that such a system is necessary under the conditions and that it produces wonderful results. Prostitutes and gamblers are kept out, there are no saloons, liquor can be brought in only on order, and the company allows no liquor wagon to leave a case of beer at any house where lately there has been drunkenness or "rough-house." This man was a good man, but he did not consider whether the system was making men or making serfs. He was interested only in whether the miners drank, and how they lived. The only association secretary who could succeed in that district would be one who took that point of view, for much of his support came from the company, which was interested in preventing the men from making themselves unfit for their work.

In a certain city an energetic association sec-

THE SOCIAL TREND

retary was just completing his fund for a fine new building. One night his wife was called out to a case of distress, through which he got an insight into the bad conditions surrounding young working-women in his city. After carefully getting up his facts, he formed a committee, secured speakers, and announced that on Friday there would be a public meeting to consider the problem of the young working-women in local industries. Promptly he was summoned by telephone to meet the directors of his association, and when he entered the room, one of his Christian backers burst out upon him with, "What in h—l do you mean by getting up this public meeting? Don't you know I've got eighty girls working in the basement of my department-store?" His other directors were equally stern, and he was ordered to call off his meeting or lose all the important contributions to his building fund. He held his meeting and immediately thereafter resigned.

I greatly admire the Young Men's Christian Association, and the only reason that I mention it so often here is because I have oftener stumbled upon its problems. But it is no more em-

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

barrassed in this respect than are the church and the church philanthropies.

Nor are the secular charities free. During a strike of the iron-molders in a mining-machinery works in a State capital, the company declared a lock-out and advertised throughout the State: "Wanted, skilled iron-molders. Good pay. No strike." Some molders removed to the capital to get this work and found too late that they were to be used as strike-breakers. Two such families sought relief of the Associated Charities, and the secretary expostulated with the president of the machinery company for bringing up-state iron-molders into distress by luring them into a strike situation. The reply he got was: "You people can't complain of having to handle such cases. Don't we contribute \$150 a year to your work?"

A student of mine, after three years of charity organization work, said to me: "Professor, I've quit. There's nothing *in* it. The game's too thin. We coax money from the people who are the beneficiaries of the abuses that produce the wrecks we deal with. They let us deal with the wrecks, but we can't touch or even show up the

THE SOCIAL TREND

conditions that produce them, because that would affect their income." And the young man concluded: "No more for me. I'm going to be a factory inspector, or something of that sort, where I won't be a dead letter."

§ 3

The head worker of a social settlement, who had made plans for a much-needed housing investigation in the vicinity of the settlement, had to ditch the investigation because real estate owners, who contributed each a few hundred dollars a year to the settlement fund, sent word that they were able to look after their property themselves.

In another case, a board representing the "donor" point of view so curbs the head worker in his endeavors to take part in the movements affecting the welfare of his neighborhood that he avows to me that he is straining every nerve to gain sufficient financial support in his neighborhood to justify him in cutting loose entirely from down-town philanthropists.

A social worker who had resided in many settlements said to me: "Most of the successful settlement heads that I know are one thing to

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

their boards and a quite different thing to their clientèle. Unless they can play this game well, they are lost. For if at the demand of their boards they exclude radicals and socialists from settlement clubs and gatherings, censor the list of speakers, and denature the discussions before the men's club, they lose their hold on the neighborhood. If, on the other hand, the settlement is a place of free speech and the residents show a lively interest in everything affecting the welfare of the neighborhood, no matter what employers or corporations they may fall afoul of, they lose their hold on the board."

The opposition of boards of directors of settlements to giving any real power in respect to policy to a house-council consisting of the residents themselves, or to conceding any place in its direction to representatives of the various neighborhood associations which the settlement has called into being, discloses an attitude of patronage inspired by upper-class ideas as to the stewardship of the rich over the poor.

The action of the entire body of eight volunteer resident workers in one of the oldest and most renowned social settlements in this country, in withdrawing from the house because

THE SOCIAL TREND

the council (half of them Wall Street men who never come near the house and little comprehend the needs of the neighborhood) regarded it as an act of insubordination for them to join the settlement society and elect one of their own number to the council, illustrates how those who give mere money arrogate to themselves the control of the policy of the settlement to the exclusion of those who give time and service. No wonder that the *social center*, which uses public property and stands for community self-help, inspires so much more hope than the social settlement which represents the spirit of philanthropy.

Talk with a working-man and he will tell you: "To h—l with philanthropy! I want not charity, but justice." When an injured working-man receives compensation, as he does now, he can hold his head higher than he could when he was aided by a charity.

A wise settlement warden once declared in his report that a large part of the work at his settlement was "of a disappearing character." He maintained a playground in the settlement backyard just long enough to induce the park commission to establish a better one in the park across the street. He held cooking classes in

PHILANTHROPY WITH STRINGS

the settlement until the public schools put in cooking. He provided evening instruction for working-boys until the State put in a continuation school. He ran a little employment office until the State established a big, well-equipped employment bureau in his neighborhood.

Here is the natural and logical relation of philanthropy to social reform. It is the function of private philanthropy to pioneer, to experiment, to try out new things and new methods, and just as soon as it has found the right way and standardized the method that gives results, the time has come for the community to take over the function. This releases a certain amount of private time and money to go on and tackle something else. The means for initiating and carrying on experimental lines of social work must come from private benevolence, but the standardized lines of social work ought to be provided for by the community or the State.

Once the philanthropist set up a drinking fountain; now there is good city water laid on everywhere. In olden times kind-hearted people provided "ragged schools" for the waifs of the alleys; now there are public schools for all. Once the benevolent created funds to provide meals

THE SOCIAL TREND

for indigent prisoners in the jails; but John Howard induced the state to feed its prisoners. Time was when the defectives were cared for by charitable groups; now the state provides for these unfortunates. There will always be opportunity for private philanthropy to render signal services; but a democratic society with a proper spirit of independence will not allow itself to form the bad habit of leaning upon the large private donor, but will take as its maxim, "Let us do it ourselves."

VIII

PROHIBITION AS THE SOCIOLOGIST SEES IT ¹

§ 1

SIXTEEN years ago thoughtful Chinese woke to a realization of how the opium cancer had eaten into their vitals. The use of the drug had spread with truly appalling rapidity. The Chinese people were using *seventy times* as much as they had used in 1800. Annually *twenty-two thousand tons of opium were absorbed*, most of it converted into thick smoke and inhaled by a legion of smokers estimated to number at least twenty-five millions. In the poppy-growing provinces a shocking proportion of the adults were addicted to the habit. In the cities of Szechuan half the men and a fifth of the women smoked. In Kansu three men out of four were devotees of the pipe. Districts were to be found in which virtually the whole adult population had given themselves up to the seduction and

¹ Courtesy of "Harper's Magazine."

THE SOCIAL TREND

were sinking into a state of indescribable lethargy, misery, and degradation.

Realizing that unless the people speedily renounced the vice that was undermining its manhood there was no hope for China among the nations, the empress dowager issued, in 1906, the famous Anti-opium Edict, the opening gun in the most extensive warfare on a destructive private habit that the world has ever known. In 1910 I traveled for months through the far interior of China and on every hand met evidences of the resolute fight to stamp out the production of opium. In many districts where the poppy had been the staple crop, like corn in Kansas or cotton in Alabama, not a poppy field was to be seen. As a result, the local price of opium was from two to ten times that of the year before, while food was more plentiful and cheap than it had been for years.

As week after week I traversed the scene of conflicts, often fierce and sometimes bloody, between the officials supported by the reformers and patriots, and the poppy-growers, traders, and den-keepers supported feebly by the slaves of the pipe, I reflected, "Is any vice coiling itself about us whites as opium coiled itself

PROHIBITION

about the Chinese?" As in a flash I saw that alcohol is to our people what opium is to the yellow race. And their experience had established that *there are private drug habits society dares not let alone*. For a very long time the hand of government had been withheld in China, and if any principle of self-limitation lurked in the opium vice it ought to have declared itself long before. But, as a matter of fact, opium smoking did not confine itself to fools and weaklings. It did not consume the chaff and leave the wheat. Like a gangrene, it ate deeper and deeper into the social body, spreading from weak tissue to sound, until the very existence of the Chinese race was at stake.

Moral suasion had not availed to arrest the progress of the gangrene. It had been found necessary to resort to heroic treatment, i. e., to make opium inaccessible. Might not *our* gangrene, despite the growth of temperance sentiment, go on eating into us until we made alcoholic beverages inaccessible?

Thus China's experience with the juice of the poppy converted me to prohibition.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 2

The "dry" movement in this country was by no means a fanatical outburst against a vice already beaten to its knees by half a century of temperance agitation. What happened among us was that a part of American society turned away from liquor while the rest became wetter and wetter. The army of drinkers which survived the temperance simoon of the forties and fifties of the last century had been reinforced by millions of immigrants—Irish and Germans and Slavs—many of whom, owing to their relatively high earnings in this country, found themselves able for the first time to indulge freely in alcoholic pleasures.

Another momentous thing happened—a profound change in the system for supplying drink. The catering of liquor became commercialized. It came to be a "big business" intent on profits—always more profits. From being shrinking and apologetic, it became brazen and aggressive. It no longer pleaded humbly for leave to assuage existing thirsts. In order to "promote business" it deliberately and methodically set itself to create new thirsts. It advertised, gave away

PROHIBITION

samples, subsidized convivial organizations, encouraged festal customs, of a "damp" character. planted saloons in new places, and brought them into close partnership with the great social plagues, gambling and prostitution. In olden time alcoholic beverages were no more "pushed" than hen's eggs are "pushed." But as production and distribution were centralized, the business grew more capitalistic, the saloon-keeper came to be the brewer's man, while systematic efforts were made to "shove" liquor, especially beer. Between 1880 and 1907 the annual per capita consumption of all liquors in this country rose *from ten gallons to nearly twenty-three gallons!* Far, then, from being a superfluous stroke at a dying social custom, prohibition was an urgent social-defense measure forced by greedy liquor interests which were so short-sighted that they would not leave non-drinkers alone. Continually they plotted to tempt the public into a larger consumption. Their ambition seemed to be to convert the rising generation of males into peripatetic tanks.

A long and variegated experience with attempts to regulate the liquor traffic showed that it was incapable of being made decent and law-

THE SOCIAL TREND

abiding. It would respect no law, heed no warnings or protests. Always it was secretly digging under or insolently breaking over any bounds the community set to it. So, not out of a sour resentment of other people's pleasures, but out of bitter experience with an unmitigated social evil, grew the sentiment for destroying it, "root and branch." When parents and other earnest people realized that here was a sinister thing doing its utmost to ensnare our boys and ravel out the fabric of sound principles and good resolutions which home and school and church had been at such pains to weave into the soul of youth, they hardened their hearts and struck it down.

§ 3

Certain unforeseen developments have caused prohibition to triumph sooner than one had a right to expect. In the early crusade against alcoholism what was deplored was the intemperate use of intoxicants. The "temperate" user was the model. Later, total abstinence was urged, on the ground that the moderate drinker sets a bad example to the weak and, moreover,

PROHIBITION

runs the risk of being overpowered by his habit and swept into the abyss of excess. But thirty years ago evidence began to pour out of European physiological and psychological laboratories that *even in small quantities alcohol is an upsetter and deranger of the functions of the mind as well as of the body.* The sense of release and augmented power that comes with a glass or two was proved a cheat and a delusion. To his horror, that darling of the early moralists, the moderate drinker, was pulled from his pedestal and pilloried as an ignorant self-poisoner.

Then the development of industry came to help the besiegers of the fort of folly. The traveling public began to be nervous about the drinker at the engine-throttle, the telegraph-key, the switch-board. The factory system supplanted the handicrafts, and a new class, the employers, came to realize how drink plays havoc with production. As workers became machine tenders the damage from the liquor habit in impairment of efficiency and in injury to delicate and costly machinery became ever more unmistakable. More and more employers came to look upon prohibition as a labor-efficiency policy, and it was

THE SOCIAL TREND

largely these men who financed the movement which brought the liquor interests to grief, despite their millions for propaganda.

The World War was the crowning disaster to John Barleycorn. In the interest of military efficiency and as a food-conservation measure all the belligerent governments set clamps on liquor. This staging of drink as an economic drain and the foe of national strength has been an illuminating object-lesson to thoughtless millions. In the face of the whole world King Gambrinus has been shamed and set at naught, so that the outlawing of the drink traffic by the governments, as already the opium traffic has been outlawed, appears to be only a question of time.

§ 4

Broadly seen, prohibition is the device of the young northern peoples to overcome their constitutional handicap in competing with the older and soberer races. It seems as if all varieties of men at their first contact with intoxicants literally go crazy over them. In vinous exaltation the primitive races especially find the most glorious experience of life. To supply a tribe of Es-

PROHIBITION

kimos or Australian blacks with plenty of strong drink proved to be a swift way of despatching them. The infatuation of the American Indian for "fire-water" has been proverbial. The affinity of the indigenous population of Mexico for *pulque* and *mescal* is notorious. All down the Andean uplift the natives are gradually destroying themselves with *chicha* and *pisco*. The "unconquerable" Araucanians were in the end bowled over by the product of distilleries planted among them for that very purpose. The worst alcoholism in the world to-day is among the Chilean masses, who are more than half Indian.

Once a people has easy access to what an Irish poet, who sang a thousand years ago, called "the heavenly dew," it begins to undergo "alcoholic selection." Those to whom the delights of intoxication are irresistible sooner or later drink themselves to death or, at any rate, leave a weakened progeny which quickly perish. Conversely, the sober survive and they transmit to their posterity their distaste for vinous exhilaration. Some of the Mediterranean peoples have known the vine for four or five thousand years, so that long ago those among them who

THE SOCIAL TREND

could not refrain from abusing the "blood of the grape" eliminated themselves. Sooner or later their intemperate stocks ran out, the result being that the sobriety of these peoples is the marvel of the later arrivals at the banquet of civilization. Alcoholic selection no doubt set in among the nomad Israelites with their settlement in the Promised Land. It was sure to come when every man dwelt "under his own vine and fig-tree." Naturally, therefore, the Old Testament abounds in warnings against wine, but not the New Testament, for by then the Jews had become the liquor-proof people which we find them to-day.

The early Greek lawgivers struck at drunkenness with a severity we have never touched. Alexander's Greeks were so bibulous that in one of the wine-drinking matches which he encouraged thirty-six contestants died from over-drinking. Yet in a few centuries alcoholics were nearly extinct among the Hellenes, while the modern Greeks are models of sobriety.

Having never been exposed to the test of the flowing bowl, the early Teutons were terrible was-sailers. Tacitus remarks, "Intemperance proves as effectual in subduing them as the force of

PROHIBITION

arms." But in the course of the Dark Ages the monasteries spread the cultivation of the vine over the slopes of southern Germany, so that all through the Middle Ages their furious drinkers were quaffing themselves to destruction. This is why to-day the Germans occupy in respect to alcoholism a middle place between northern and southern peoples. An analysis of 2075 charity cases in our cities showed that drink as the cause of poverty occurs but half as often among the German cases as among the Irish, and two thirds as often as among native American cases. Among the foreign-born in our jails and prisons only one German in twenty-two was committed for intoxication as against one out of three Irish, one out of five Scotch, and one out of eight Scandinavians.

How amazing is the contrast between races in their constitutional craving to be "lit up" comes out very clearly in the records of the charity hospitals of New York. Liquor is responsible for more than a fifth of the cases treated. It is the root of the trouble in a quarter of the native Americans treated, in a third of the Irish patients, and in *two fifths* of the native-born of Irish

THE SOCIAL TREND

fathers. On the other hand, one out of sixty Italian patients, one out of seventy Magyar patients, one out of eighty Polish patients, and one out of a hundred Hebrew patients is in the hospital on account of inebriety!

Or take the sons of the "land of the vine." The proportion of Italian charity cases chargeable to drink is only a sixth of that for foreign-born cases and a seventh of that for cases among native Americans. Alcoholism is found among the Italians in the charity hospitals *from a tenth to a twentieth as often* as among north-European patients in the same institutions.

From the hygienic point of view it is a great pity that the people of this country are overwhelmingly of northern extraction. It is certain that there would be no liquor problem here, ergo no prohibition, if sober Neapolitans had landed on Plymouth Rock, if abstinent Portuguese had settled Virginia instead of hard-drinking English, if temperate Wallachians had planted themselves in Pennsylvania instead of thirsty Germans and Scotch-Irish, if coffee-sipping Turks had peopled the West instead of bibulous Hibernians and Scandinavians. Had we

PROHIBITION

Americans only the anti-alcoholic inheritance of Cretans, Syrians, and Armenians, we might dispense with "restrictions on personal liberty."

But, being what we are, there are open to us just two solutions of the drink problem. Stoically we may submit ourselves to alcoholic selection—a process in our case made trebly devastating by the modern cheapness of manufacture of alcoholic beverages and the facilities for keeping them at every man's elbow all the time. In anguish we may endure the loss of perhaps a million lives a decade from intemperance as result of the hurricane of temptation the uncurbed liquor interests would let loose upon us. With aching hearts we may tolerate the wrecking of perhaps half a million homes in the same period. We may steel ourselves while myriads of wives and mothers have their lives poisoned by worry lest some of their dear ones fall a prey to the insidious drug. Well, the reward for consistently keeping our hands off the agent of havoc would be that by the end of this century we should have passed the peak of our suffering and by the year 2100 A. D. our descendants might

THE SOCIAL TREND

be as constitutionally resistant to alcoholic beguilement as are the Portuguese to-day!

The alternative to this dismal prospect is prohibition—i. e., wringing the neck of the liquor business so that our unfortunate temptables, no longer teased and baited and snared for the sake of the profit to be extracted from their weakness for alcohol, will be left free to pursue the normal interests of life.

What social effects—other than the lessening of crime and pauperism, which are too obvious to be worth discussing—may be anticipated from the banishment of strong drink?

For one thing, it is bound to improve the position of women, especially in the lower levels of society. Liquor has been the great enemy of the abstinent sex. No thoughtful woman finds anything captivating in a drinking song or takes "John Barleycorn" as a joke. Usually deep potations let loose the satyr in man and put attractive women at the mercy of lust coupled with superior physical strength. The female vampire, of course, will lose one of her means of making infatuated males submit to her blood-sucking; but decent women, who have to trust their brains and character to command from the

PROHIBITION

more muscular sex the respect to which they feel entitled, know that their moral and intellectual merits are never at greater discount than in the eyes of intoxicated men.

If we succeed in making an end of toping there will be one stone the less in the way of Cupid's car. Machine industry and certain other economic developments, by opening to the weaker sex countless opportunities of self-support, have relieved capable young women of the economic necessity of marriage. Working-girls now scoff at taking husbands "for the sake of a meal-ticket," and are more inclined to consider whether life with the wooer opens a prospect of happiness. With the spread of this critical attitude toward marriage no doubt there must be a growing number of young women who remain single rather than tie themselves to a man whose drinking habits arouse their distrust. So far as this is the case, the change we may look for in social customs ought to promote matrimony by increasing the number of eligible young men and diminishing the risks of the self-supporting girl who marries.

In prohibition the home scores a signal triumph. It is a matter of common knowledge

THE SOCIAL TREND

that among the masses in Europe the sexes have never gone asunder in their pastimes to the extent that they have in our wage-earning population. Among us the taboo on woman's sharing of vinous delights (which came to be considered the exclusive prerogative of the male) set up as counter-attraction to the home the male drinking resort, in which, unlike the German *biergarten* and the English "public house," a decent woman was never to be seen.

Thereupon began a silent but determined duel between the American wife, seeking to retain the companionship of her mate and have his coöperation in rearing their children, and the keeper of the male resort on the lookout for profitable patrons. The wife lured her husband, and later her sons, with the comforts and charms of home—rugs and curtains, the easy-chair, the trimmed lamp, games, books, music, and the society of good women. The saloon-keeper lured with bright lights, the shining bar, the brass rail, glistening glass, huge mirrors, sensual paintings, privacy for "a quiet game," and (sometimes) the society of loose women.

The duel went on with varying fortunes. It

PROHIBITION

turned out that in most cases the American women of the "middle" class had the time, means, and ingenuity to create for their men a domestic environment which possessed greater attractiveness than the male drinking resort. Among wage-earners, however, overcrowding, poverty, and want of knowledge too often thwarted the wife's pathetic endeavor to tempt her man to spend his time and money in the home rather than in the saloon. Now, happily, prohibition comes to the assistance of this much-enduring woman and opens to her the means to build a home which will give her and her daughters an opportunity to exert a refining influence upon the coarser natures of her menfolk.

Says a report from Richmond: "Hundreds of men are taking the pay envelope home now and spending their evenings there, men who had not done so before in twenty years. Without doubt, one of the first things that drinking men do when the saloon is no longer open to them is to move back into their homes, and then to move themselves and their families into better homes." In Denver the gas company found that under prohibition, despite the shutting

THE SOCIAL TREND

down of the saloons, its business steadily increased because more gas was being used in the homes.

When one wearies of the home it is now not the male resort—pool-room, men's club, coffee-house, or other "substitute for the saloon"—that is likely to be visited, but rather some recreation place which men and women, parents and children, can enjoy together. It will be the park, the "zoo," the soda-fountain, the motion-film theater, or the social center. With the ending of the sociability institution built up about the absorption of alcohol the members of the family are encouraged to have more of their pleasures in common.

Not only is there prospect of women enjoying greater consideration and influence with men, but with prohibition a vista of hope is opened for multitudes of hapless children. Since their security lies primarily in their unconscious appeal to the tender instinct and to the sense of obligation, children suffer the most from the drinking habits of the bread-winner. Liquor soon blunts the parental sense of obligation, while, by setting aside ordinary every-day inhibitions, it opens a freer course to the instincts.

PROHIBITION

This unbridling of the primitive self seems to favor the more elemental instincts, such as pugnacity, lust, and self-assertion. In general, the man under the influence of liquor tramples brutally upon the rights and claims of his children. Occasionally a man is actually more generous and tender in his cups than when sober, but the rule is the other way. Now that, on top of free public education and the banning of child labor, the saloon-keeper's till will no longer jingle with the money which should feed and clothe the wage-earner's children, we may look for a generation of young people virtually all of whom will have had their chance.

Those in whom the glass is wedded to good fellowship and good fellowship is wedded to the glass will have trouble in finding new means of bridging the gulf that has resulted. Still, substitute thawers will be found, for nobody has ever pretended that, on the whole, abstainers are less sympathetic and brotherly, more self-centered and shut up within themselves, than drinkers. If it requires potations to set up a genial current of feeling, how hedged and lonesome must be the Rumanian, the Arab, the Gipsy, the Syrian! And, on the other hand, what a

THE SOCIAL TREND

loving expansive wight the Russian, the Norwegian, the Scot must have been half a century ago, before the desiccation of northern Europe began!

The fact is, whatever social custom bids men do together in token of friendliness will presently become charged with significance and set up a flow of good feeling between the participants. To "get next," Near-Easterners drink coffee, while Far-Easterners drink tea. Our ancestors hit upon the custom of touching glasses and swallowing beverages of high alcoholic content. There is no reason to suppose that sipping "soft" drinks together, or smoking together, or playing backgammon together might not serve equally well as a symbol of amity.

Then, too, much of the crude, maudlin gregariousness that comes after the third glass is a temporary, deceptive thing—fool's gold. You can't build anything on it. Is there any continuing good work—Red Cross or Belgian relief, or the reclamation of the "down and out"—which has relied on the social feeling evoked by alcoholic drink?

The wine-cup has played a part in relieving ennui, banishing care, and helping men forget

PROHIBITION

their troubles. Many of long-established habits will therefore be hard put to it to open fresh sources of solace and inspiration. Still, such sources will be found, let no one doubt it. In Kansas a generation has grown up without recourse to liquor, and one hears more young people singing of an evening in a Kansas town than one hears in the lands of the vine. In the eighteenth century much hard toying went on among American college students. The custom has passed away, but in its place have sprung up many varieties of "high jinks" unknown to the college of olden time—"rushes" and "hops," "song fests" and "circuses," athletic "meets" and foot-ball "rallies." With wassail or without, the spirit of youth will sparkle and foam.

In all previous wars it has been considered inevitable that men removed from home and exposed to the frightful boredom of barracks and camp and trenches should drink in order to brighten a black existence. One of the most glowing chapters in the history of the World War will be the story of the successful efforts to provide for the social recreation of our soldiers overseas and in the training-camps. A really marvelous ingenuity and insight into human nature

THE SOCIAL TREND

has been shown by the religious agencies working to supply our soldiers at home and abroad with recreation which will banish tedium and outpull the allurements of vice. It is not too much to say that the problem of satisfying the social instinct of segregated men without the aid of intoxicants has been solved and—we may be proud of the fact—solved by Americans!

That the closing of the saloon will go a long way toward purifying politics nobody will deny. The wholesale use of free drinks to sway the electorate is one of the blackest chapters in the history of political democracy. The defenders of governing dynasties and classes love to point to the rôle of liquor in the selections which register the will of the "sovereign people." Long before any other curb was imposed on the liquor sellers, the American commonwealths closed the saloons on election day in order to prevent scandalous scenes of orgy and riot about the polling booths. Money will continue to be used illegitimately in politics, and under prohibition men will be found who will sell their votes. But it is safe to predict that fewer votes will be corruptly swayed and that they will never again be sold at such bargain prices as in the

PROHIBITION

days when no limit was imposed on the rôle of liquor in politics.

Since it has been the element with the fewest wholesome pleasures and recreations, the wage-earners rather than the business men, the professional men, or the leisure class, which has been hardest hit by alcoholism, we may anticipate that the banishing of strong drink will result in accelerating the economic and political advance of labor. The free drinkers among the wage-earners have furnished few resolute or intelligent fighters for the working-men's cause. They have been so many weak spots in labor's phalanx. In a dry society it will be harder to fuddle and befool the worker into voting for policies which are in the interest of another class and against the advancement of his own class.

One of the great surprises of Soviet Russia has been that it has not dissolved in chaos. Contrary to what we expected, the "man on horseback" has not taken charge and the Russians do not think he is coming. That a workers-and-peasants' regime did not result in anarchy leading to a military dictatorship is largely owing to the heavy hand the leaders laid on

THE SOCIAL TREND

liquor. Warned by the scenes of demoralization which followed access of the Red Guard to the wine-cellars of the Winter Palace, the *kommissars* went about to destroy the numerous hidden stocks stored for the refreshment of the Petrograd well-to-do. In December, 1917, I beheld sights which would have cheered the heart of the royal author of the proverb, "Wine is a mocker." I saw men in wrecked wine-cellars wading up to their ankles in the ruddy liquid and the snow of a street stained rich red where fire-hose was draining the contents of the cellars into the sewers. Here, perhaps, is the secret of why the Russian proletarian revolution has not followed the course which history led us to expect.

IX

THE LEGAL PROFESSION FROM THE SOCIAL POINT OF VIEW

THERE is a world of difference between calling a man a "good" lawyer and calling him a "good" bacteriologist or health officer. In the one case the man is appraised from the private point of view, in the other from the public point of view. Winning cases is not social service; it is social service to help justice prevail and to make the law respected. The "good" lawyer like as not aids the wrong cause as often as he aids the right; oftener, in fact, for owing to his reputation for winning "hard" cases his talents will be sought by litigants who have the least to say for themselves. It used to be said of the leading criminal lawyer of Massachusetts that no crook undertook a serious crime in that State without first inquiring as to the health of Rufus Choate. The "good" health officer, on the other hand, is "good" from the community point of

THE SOCIAL TREND

view, not from the point of view of a litigant with a weak case or a law-breaker facing trial.

Lawyers are experts as to legal rights, so there is no place for them in a despotic society. They flourish only under free government and are justly proud of the fact that the bar unanimously offers resistance to any tendency to arbitrary rule. This, however, constitutes no sweeping certificate of merit for the legal profession. The oft-lauded services it renders to society are real, but so are its disservices, which it is careful never to mention.

Subject, of course, to the restrictions of the professional code, lawyers generally practise law for gain. Usually the litigant with the more money to spend on his case will command the services of the abler lawyers, i. e., those who have the reputation of winning cases. The wrong decisions these lawyers are able to bring about when pitted against weak or inexperienced opponents become precedents quoted in future lawsuits. Thus, under the system of judge-made law, the legal rights of the financially weaker class of litigants are continually nibbled away, while the class confronting them accumulates unfair advantage. As on the foot-

THE LEGAL PROFESSION

ball field the team with the better interference gains ground from the other team, so in the struggle between opposed classes the high-priced astute lawyers constitute the "interference" for the side with the more money to spend. The doctrine of the assumption of risk could never have reached its concluding stage of monstrosity but for the inequality of pressure applied to it from opposite sides.

When the balance of rights has been so disturbed that the weaker class regularly gets the worst of it in court, a political struggle for redress breaks out. But once the legislature has been moved to enact a statute setting back the stakes to the old line, the ingenious lawyers of the interest affected proceed by clever sophistries and hair-splittings to befuddle the judges until they have whittled the statute down to the vanishing-point.

Aside, then, from bringing about the triumph of injustice in particular adjudicated cases, the practice of lawyers following the bigger retainer contributes to destroy the equilibrium of classes by aiding the rich and concentrated interest to encroach upon the one that is poor or scattered.

THE SOCIAL TREND

Until the establishment of railroad and public utility commissions, the rights of railway passengers, gas consumers, and telephone users were being nibbled away by just this inequality in litigation. In such relations as between merchant and customer, master and seaman, master and servant, the cumulative effects of the one side's commanding always the better lawyers have been serious, nay even disastrous. One motive in the creation on all hands of pure food commissions, trade commissions, and industrial commissions has been to correct the dangerous list resulting from the gravitating of legal ability to the side with the larger purse. Before these tribunals of experts, making up their minds not on ordinary court-room testimony but on the findings of trained investigators, the power of the lawyer to affect the decision is so circumscribed as to threaten his eventual elimination.

A visitor from Mars would be amazed that an adroit lawyer who has amassed a fortune helping corporations to enrich themselves at the expense of the public should ever have the effrontery to seek political favors at the hands of his fellow-citizens. Stranger yet, the voters some-

THE LEGAL PROFESSION

times make such a man governor or senator under the impression that they are getting a "smart" man's services for a tithe of their commercial value. Of course, in such cases the voters make a bad bargain. Men do not gather figs from thistles, secure the best social service from the hardened private servant. The corporation "counsel" who late in life takes on the public as his client may mean well by his new client, but he is usually incapable of perceiving the public interest at points where it clashes with the private interests he has been accustomed to champion.

Voters would never do such foolish things had they not been steadily plied with the false doctrine that the bar *in toto* is the bulwark of popular rights, and that the lawyer who consistently serves the private interest which offers him the most money is in some mysterious way rendering a public service. The truth is, of course, that this type of attorney is to the faithful defender of the actual legal rights of his client what the hired gunman is to the loyal policeman, what the professional expert witness is to the genuine chemist or alienist. In the light of healthy common sense, the lawyer who hires

THE SOCIAL TREND

himself without conviction is no more respectable than the woman who hires herself without love.

The doubtfulness of the legal profession from the social point of view comes out clearly when one compares it with other professions. Engineers do not pit their science and ingenuity against one another but against nature. Physicians are not thrusting against each other but against disease. Teachers combat not other teachers but ignorance. These serve society by serving private interests which are harmonious with the public interest. But half, perhaps even three fourths, of the learning, logic, labor, and ingenuity of the legal profession, probably the best manned of them all, is wasted in blow and parry, thrust and counter-thrust. Only a fraction of the labors of lawyers actually serves society by drawing out the truth, clearing up situations, clarifying rights, and developing law in the direction of social need.

The waste of lawyers' efforts through forensic contention is like that of competing advertising experts—only the public have never perceived it as they perceive the waste of advertising. The latter is so evident that its service in stimulat-

THE LEGAL PROFESSION

ing and educating consumers to avail themselves of new utilities is overlooked. There is something pathetic in the plea of "ad men" to be taken seriously by a public too likely to regard them as nothing but artists in convincing mendacity. No doubt their coming together to raise ethical standards for their work and cast out the liars will in time gain them that standing with the public which they deserve.

Of the intellectual eminence of the legal profession there can be no question. So alluring are forensic triumphs, so rich the rewards of success, that when in my classes I detect an unusually brilliant student and, in the hope of steering him into creative scholarship, ask him what he intends to do, it is almost a foregone conclusion that he will reply he intends going into the law. The close relation of the law to politics, arising in part from the ease with which the practice of law can be dropped and resumed after a period of public life, lends it an added attractiveness in the eyes of ambitious young men.

Intellectually, too, the lawyer keeps himself remarkably fit. Pitted always against opponents who pounce with joy upon every loose statement of his, every flaw of reasoning, every awkward

THE SOCIAL TREND

use of citation or evidence, he is required always to keep himself in training like an athlete. The preacher becomes soft from preaching to those who will never take him to task for the holes in his logic. The teacher becomes oracular and enervated from continually handing down his ideas to immature minds unable to confute him. The editor grows flabby who can take his time about replying to criticism. The lawyer, on the other hand, has to keep hard his intellectual thews, for his success hinges on his constant readiness to put up a good defense. No wonder that the public has formed the habit of looking to the bar for guidance.

And yet, while private, oftentimes even anti-social service, prevails over social service in the practice of law, while the majority of lawyers are unable to distinguish the sham from the genuine in social service, it would be well if the public harkened less to the opinion of lawyers and listened more to the advice of the more disinterested and socialized scholars, social workers, sanitarians, school-men, geologists, and economists. Looking as these do to the public for employment, they have not trained themselves into taking the private and oftentimes anti-social point of view.

X

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE EXPERT

IT is fortunate that at a time when social interests are coming to be more distinct and segregated from private interests, society finds at its elbow servants of a new type of loyalty. For two centuries there has been growing up in the experimental laboratory an ideal of exactness and a reverence for tested fact, since without these there would be no success in the high enterprise of wrestling from nature her secrets. Brilliantly justified in physics and chemistry the laboratory method has of late been applied to many other fields. Nearly all branches of inquiry have adopted this procedure for widening the bounds of truth. The standing of a university as a research institution is determined by its laboratories. The buildings of a modern medical school consist almost entirely of laboratories. Nowadays the first thing wise men do when they are face to face with a grave

THE SOCIAL TREND

problem, relating, say, to food values or ventilation or juvenile delinquency, or whether animals reason, or the harmfulness of adulterants, is to equip a research laboratory for working it out. We have realized that the old-fashioned reflection and discussion are but a poor method of finding truth.

The spirit of the laboratory is a sense of the all-importance of fact, a nervousness as to error, a willingness to take infinite pains in measuring and verifying. Formerly only chemists and engineers went out into their life work with this spirit. But of late laboratories have so multiplied in the universities, the research bureaus of government, and the big industrial concerns, that you will find this spirit in many groups of social servants, such as physicians, psychiatrists, criminologists, statisticians, sanitarians, charity agents, social workers, factory inspectors, and probation officers. The lawyers and the preachers have scarcely caught it, but in the school of journalism with "Accuracy always" a wall motto and a daily prayer the students are getting it. Whether the conditions of newspaper employment will permit them to act upon it remains to be seen.

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE EXPERT

The laboratory technique was developed in the interest of inquiry into nature. The spirit grew up as a child of the passion for universal or scientific truth. But there is no reason why it should not be also the handmaiden of the quest for practical truth. Taking pains to eliminate error, conscientious observation, scrupulous fidelity in reporting what has been found—surely these need not be confined to the priests of pure science! Why may not the newspaper reporter, the public accountant, the census agent, the wage investigator, the health inspector, the psychopathic expert attached to the juvenile court be stirred by the same religion?

This laboratory spirit, like the spark of radium incessantly sparkling at the bottom of the spinthariscopes, is the moral capital of the expert, the divine spark that keeps him loyal and incorruptible. It is this asset which accounts for the rapidly growing willingness to use him in the public service. There is of course no such thing as "government by experts." The malicious phrase is but a sneer flung by the scheming self-seekers who find in the relentless veracity of modestly-paid trained investigators a barrier across their path. There is nothing to indicate

THE SOCIAL TREND

that experts in social or governmental problems will be as freely chosen for legislature or for public office as are now lawyers and business men. But it is certain that society will more and more make use of the expert, not so much because he has special knowledge and the correct method of acquiring knowledge as because he brings to his task a certain fanaticism for truth which has become infinitely precious now that at so many points powerful selfish agencies are at work to distort or suppress the truth. Who could have foreseen a quarter of a century ago that the young people going out from our university laboratories and seminaries would show such resistance as they have shown to temptation and intimidation? Something of the high passion of science is in them and keeps them immune while they breathe infected air.

This conscience of the expert is a new ally in the eternal fight for the public weal. Public spirit, civic passion, loyalty to one's oath of office—these are moral forces of long standing. The expert's conscience is none of these, although, of course, it is often associated with them. It is not at all the same thing as love of your fellow-men or devotion to the state. It

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE EXPERT

may appear in persons who are not in the least reformers or uplifters. It consists in a determination, come what may, *to find the exact truth about the matter committed to one and to report that truth.* Whether or not a good use is made of this truth is not the expert's chief concern. How he will feel as to *that* depends on his quality as a man and a citizen. His conscience is at peace once he has communicated the truth it is his business to discover to those who ought to use it. And this is natural, for there is nothing intense that is not narrow. Army officer, jockey, and prize-fighter—each will risk anything for his honor because it relates to just *one* thing. The officer must not run away, the jockey “pull” his horse, or the boxer “throw” the fight. Likewise the honor of the expert consists in just one thing, viz., reporting the exact truth. That done he lapses into the man and the citizen.

XI

TRAINING CITIZENS WITH "SPUNK" FOR SOCIAL SERVICE ¹

§ 1

WITHIN the last twenty years many of our colleges and universities have caught something of the social view of things. But in the schools naïve commercial ideas prevail. Our more promising youth still issue from the class-room into practical life with glowing visions of a personal and private success. They have been told of the wonderful chance to rise and have been stimulated with the assurance that the harder they studied the sooner they would get up in life. "Out in the world," we tell them, "there is the great game, and there are the great prizes. Go in and win." Upon many of us it has not dawned that one aim of our public schools should be to make it impossible for our young folks to accept the game as they find it.

¹ An address before the National Educational Association.

THE SOCIAL TREND

Into the public mind have filtered during the last twenty years many of the newer ideas about the meaning of industry and trade. But, on the other hand, business men have been drawing together into associations and harkening to the utterances of their big dominating personalities. While the social view has been making headway in the general public, the contrary manner of thinking has been hardening and defining itself within the business world.

Commercialism has become self-conscious and aggressive. It insists that business is an arena in which the strong-hearted and the capable contend with one another for the Supremely Desirable, i. e., money. In this battle, strength has a place and cunning has a place. The "tricks of the trade" are to be tolerated as we tolerate the feints and ruses of the prize-ring. Obviously, the rules of the fight should not be changed while the fight is going on, and, of course, the fight is going on all the time. To tie down the combatants with rules limiting the use of their superior strength, adroitness, or cunning, spoils sport and is unfair to the "better man."

In these commercial battles, natural resources, working-men, and child toilers come to be looked

THE SOCIAL TREND

upon as mere raw material to be moved about, husbanded, or sacrificed, as the exigencies of the fight may demand. As to the consuming public—for the sake of which, in sooth, all such enterprise exists—it lies vague in the dim background with no interest in the fight save as humble and admiring spectators. The hampering of the contending business men with pure food laws, sanitary requirements, safety regulations, anti-combination acts, and finally the meddling of a trade commission, on the alleged behalf of the consuming public, is held to be an intrusion and an impertinence inflicted on “legitimate business” by the demagogy of “politicians.”

In some of the professions likewise the combat idea is well established. The typical newspaper man is by no means apologetic as to the sensationalism, red ink, fakes, deceitful head-lines, and spiced news, by which he has beaten his rival in circulation.

Most of the lawyers are warm defenders of the time-hallowed contentious procedure by which our courts ascertain the right and wrong of disputes, despite the obvious consideration

SOCIAL SERVICE

that the stronger side ought to win the case, not the side with the stronger champion.

§ 2

Despite the impression social ideas have made on the worker and the producer, commercialism has gone on developing within its sphere until it is becoming a religion. Boards of trade and chambers of commerce are its temples. The business interests are its priests. Its holy days are Monday to Saturday. Its promise is prosperity. Its first great commandment is "Let us alone." Its plea is "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not." Its beatitude is "Blessed is the employee who demands nothing and expects nothing, for verily he shall not be disappointed." Its favorite parable is of the man who burned down his barn to get rid of the rats.

This whole conception of business as a jungle fight, with its implied admiration of the money-maker as a wonderfully powerful and clever fellow, its thinly veiled contempt for a man who wins only a livelihood, its cool ignoring of the public for whose sake business exists, belongs

THE SOCIAL TREND

in a class with trial by ordeal and judicial combat. Slowly there is rising in the popular mind the idea that businesses and professions are not owned by the men who, for the moment, are engaged in them, that they are but instrumentalities for meeting the wants of the public, not roped rings for the conduct of a prize-fight; that while oceans of legal verbiage are poured forth on the question whether or not this or that business is "affected with a public interest," *there is, in fact, no legitimate business or profession that is not affected with a public interest, and should not be required to square itself with the ascertained social welfare.*

§ 3

The social service that is supreme is not some bit of charitable work, but the following of one's calling as service, not as exploit. Education for social service is to open the eyes of the young to the social nature of their work in life, to purge their minds of a current false notion that to enter one's life work is to take a hand in a poker-game or put on the gloves for a prize-fight. It is to persuade them that it is wisdom to spend wealth for more welfare, but folly to

SOCIAL SERVICE

spend welfare—even somebody else's welfare—for the sake of more wealth, that industries should be run to yield livelihoods rather than profits, that a "living wage" should come before a "living dividend," that commercialized sports, commercialized amusements, commercialized newspapers, and commercialized vice are tumors, not flesh, that "prosperity" in the business man's sense is but one element in social well-being and not always the greatest.

The next social service is to fight the anti-social tendency of the combat régime. Education for social service ought not to damp the primal impulses of moral indignation. Six sevenths of American teachers are women, and there is danger lest they, with their ladylike ideas of conduct, quench the natural pugnacity of our boys below the point of even chivalrous "spunk." Certainly, a woman-taught generation is showing an alarming willingness to take oppression and robbery lying down. The good government movement, I observe, attracts many mild-mannered gentlemanly citizens quite bluffed by the wardheeler's invitation to the use of the natural weapons. I fear our schools are turning out too many sissies, and that the rough greedy ele-

THE SOCIAL TREND

ment are taking advantage of it. I for one deplore the ladylike citizen. Social service implies not only a willingness to be spent for the common good, but, as well, a capacity for ire and hard hitting.

§ 4

One way to divert the people from fundamentals is to get them hurraing for petty betterments. I sometimes suspect that trivial social service is employed to side-track people from economic reform. The kept newspaper is strong for "swat the-fly," anti-roller-towel, and "clean-up" movements. Likewise, it seems as if little charities for newsboys or tenement babies or hospitals prosper greatly just because they raise no embarrassing questions and leave the public with a soothing illusion that something adequate is being done.

It seems to me sometimes as if the springing up of a great variety of petty charities which annoy nobody, antagonize nobody, and produce but trifling results, is to be interpreted as an endeavor to switch the public mind from the big social services involving questions of fares,

SOCIAL SERVICE

prices, wages, hours, and conditions of work, which antagonize prominent people but which also hold forth the possibility of raising the plane upon which great groups of us live. Not that there is a purpose behind it all; but those who start innocent charities get support and put them through, while those who promote movements that lessen somebody's profits or dividends or rentals get the cold shoulder and fail. So that the promoters of social service learn the lesson, "Ask for reading-rooms, or fresh air, or teddy-bears; don't ask for less risk or fewer hours, or for more pay or more rights."

A democracy, then, will use its schools to counteract the anti-social spirit that too often radiates from the big masterful figures of commercial life. It will rear its youth in the ethics of brotherhood, team-work, and responsibility. In educating for social service, it aims at something greater than lessons in kindness and consideration. It presents life from a new angle. It meets current notions of success and reward with more exacting ideals growing out of a new vision of social welfare. It aims to turn out youth ready not only to make their calling a

THE SOCIAL TREND

service, but to grapple with the old egoistic carnivorous type and eject him from places of influence where he can be a sinister model and pace-setter for the next generation.

XII

FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE

§ 1

THE old Russian government—which was a conspiracy for helping the great capitalists and landowners to hold down and exploit the producing mass, though, to be sure, these magnates were often enough sick of the corruption and wickedness of the bureaucracy that safeguarded their economic interests—withheld from Russian working-men the right to strike by requiring them to give their employer a certain number of days' notice before quitting his employ. In order to appear to “tote fair” between labor and capital, the old régime offset this by a law requiring the Russian employer to pay his dismissed employee for two weeks beyond the term of employment.

After the March, 1917, revolution an endeavor was made to enforce this law and to give the dis-

THE SOCIAL TREND

missed workman a right to a month's wages instead of a fortnight's wages. In a number of industries the month of leeway was established by joint agreement. In the typographic industry masters and men agreed to a three months' minimum term of employment. When I was at Baku in September, 1917, the oil firms were concluding an agreement with their 70,000 employees which stipulated, among other things, that on dismissal an employee should receive a month's pay for every year he had been in the service of the firm. The employers made no protest on this point for it simply made general a practice which long had been followed by the best oil companies.

In some cases the demands went pretty far. A large American manufacturing concern near Moscow was asked by its men to pay three months' dismissal wages for every year of service. On the break-up of the office force of a certain American life insurance company with headquarters in Petrograd the men put in a claim for six months' pay all around.

§ 2

I do not know how the dismissal wage idea

FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE

has fared under the new industrial order in Russia, and I have little information as to its actual working during the troublous time in 1917 before the old order was broken up. But I believe that it rests on a sound principle and deserves to be seriously considered as a means of stabilizing industrial relations in this country.

In a mature and humane civilization great importance is attached to the economic security of the individual. As the civil service develops, the public employee is protected in various ways against abrupt and undeserved dismissal. In the universities it is customary to notify the instructor some time in advance of the termination of his employment. The professor is usually given a year's notice or else his salary is continued for at least half a year after his services are dispensed with. School boards, hospitals, churches, and non-gainful organizations generally feel that it is indecent to cut off a faithful servant without giving him a reasonable time to look around for another place. Even from private employers professional men are usually able to secure an agreement not to end relations without a month or more of notice.

THE SOCIAL TREND

On the other hand, the practice of American industrial employers is really amazing in its lack of consideration for the worker found superfluous. No doubt many firms take a pride in building up and maintaining a stable labor force and give serious attention to the plight of the man they have to drop. But the average employer seems to give himself not the slightest concern as to what is to become of the worker let out through no fault of his own. I have heard of a firm long aware of the necessity of curtailment waiting till half an hour before the evening whistle blew to post a notice throwing hundreds of men out of a job for an indefinite time.

Since Americans are not generally inhumane, the barbarous "firing" policy so characteristic of our industries can be accounted for only as a survival from the time of the small concern when the competent workman let out could walk around the corner and get a job just as good. That such is not the case to-day may be learned simply by interviewing a number of workingmen as to what loss of job has meant to them. What tales of tramping the streets looking for work, of rushing hither and thither on a rumor

FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE

that this firm or that is taking on men, of returning night after night worn out and discouraged to an anxious family, of the sharp cutting down of household expenses, the begging of credit from butcher and grocer, the borrowing of small sums from one's cronies, the shattering of the hopeful plans for the children! Here are real tragedies, hundreds, nay thousands, of them a year in our large centers, yet the general public goes its way quite unconscious. No wonder among wage-earners the bitter saying is rife, "A working-man is a fool to have a wife and kids."

What of the far greater number who are employed continuously but who are always worrying lest they lose their jobs without warning? From conversation with wage-earners one gathers that fear of finding a blue slip in the pay envelope really poisons life for multitudes. So long as many employing concerns move in their present ruthless inscrutable way, not deigning to give their men any advance hint of what will happen to them, there will be resentment and unrest in the ranks of labor, no matter how reasonable the hours and pay.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 3

The tragedy in the situation of the wage-earner in the modern industrial organization has been his *insecurity*. Step by step we have lessened this. Mechanic's lien laws did away with the risk of losing his pay, postal savings banks with the risk of losing his savings, "safety first" with the risk of preventable industrial accidents, accident compensation with the risk of losing livelihood by injury in his work, pensions with the risk of a destitute old age. The chief insecurity which remains is that of losing one's job. How can we lessen that? Bestow upon the workman who has been with the employer long enough to establish the presumption that he is of value—say, six months—the legal right to receive a fortnight's free wages when he is dismissed without fault on his part. This would give him two weeks to look about and find himself another job. Even if he has nothing saved up and no credit, it would be a month or more before his family came into acute distress. There are few competent men who cannot find a job in a month unless times are hard, and during hard times their recourse will be an alto-

FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE

gether different provision, namely, unemployment insurance. Still more important, however, is the consideration that the man who has made good on the job and continues to make good would be relieved of the haunting fear of off-hand dismissal. It will not pay his employer to "fire" him for frivolous reasons, and if business is slack the men let out will be men recently taken on, who have not yet established the right to the dismissal wage.

The dismissal wage should not be looked upon as something held back out of wages which a man will never get unless he is "fired." It should be regarded in the light of the "compensation for disturbance" which some countries allow the evicted tenant who has farmed the land well.

Of course the man who "fires himself" by persistent negligence or misconduct should get no dismissal wage, and since an unscrupulous employer might charge fault when there is none, there will have to be local boards to hear complaints on this score.

The employee who quits of his own free will to take a better job or do something else has no claim. But since such an employee might

THE SOCIAL TREND

“soldier” or grow careless just in order to get himself “fired,” the employer must have the right to escape paying him a dismissal wage by proving to the local board that he is “soldiering.” As a matter of fact no workman could afford to get the reputation among employers of being that kind of a man.

Until we have accident, sickness, and old age insurance, incompetency arising from accident, sickness, or old age would not, of course, release the employer from the obligation to pay a dismissal wage. The dismissal wage might be combined with a system of unemployment insurance by providing that the unemployment allowance should not begin until the end of the term for which free wages are paid.

The legal dismissal wage should not become involved with strikes and lockouts. Let the rule be that the striker has not relinquished his job any more than the man who has been absent on account of sickness. When the man resumes his job—whether on his terms or on the employer’s—he has whatever rights he had when he struck. Only in case he applies for his job and is refused is he entitled to a dismissal wage. If he never applies, he gets nothing.

FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE

Let the lockout be looked upon as if it were a temporary stoppage owing to a fire or a dearth of fuel or raw material. When the men are taken on again all is as before. If they stay away they get nothing. If they are refused their old jobs they get the dismissal wage.

If the employer goes bankrupt his men's dismissal wages constitute precisely the same kind of claim on his assets as their back wages.

Since an employer could avoid dismissing a man by cutting his wages to so low a point that the man would quit of his own accord, the cutting of a competent workman's pay below the "going" wage for the time and place should be construed as dismissal. Likewise when an employee without fault is reduced to a lower position in the works, or is shifted permanently to harder or more onerous work, the workman should have the option of staying on or claiming dismissal pay and leaving.

What of "lay-off" when, on account of slack business, the men dismissed are not replaced? Instead of dismissing men, let the employer cut down hours uniformly in the shop, and not until he cuts them below half-time shall the men have the option of staying or of taking their dismissal

THE SOCIAL TREND

wage and leaving. When a man is laid off because there is not enough work to keep him busy but the job is supposed to be held open to him, let the dismissal wage payment be strung out through six weeks. If the employer has him back sooner he saves himself something.

A board to decide all such questions should be created in each industrial community. One member should represent employees, another employers, and the third should be named by the State industrial commission.

How would the legal dismissal wage affect employers? On all hands it is agreed that the amount of labor turnover in American industries is scandalous. I know of an industry employing 28,000 men which not long ago hired and "fired" at least that many men a year. Fifty-seven Detroit plants in 1918 took on and let out two and a half times as many men as they carried on the pay-roll. Few employers have any conception of what they lose by such a turnover. The inquiries of M. W. Alexander show that the hiring of 22,031 unneeded employees in twelve factories involved an economic waste of a million dollars. that is, $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the total wage bill.

FOR A LEGAL DISMISSAL WAGE

The obligation to pay a dismissal wage would give such employers a motive to make their practice conform to that of those thoughtful and humane employers who have brought their annual turnover in some cases down to 30 per cent. with profit to themselves and contentment to their employees. They would find it paid to give attention to human engineering, to install employment managers who would investigate why an employee is doing badly and would find a way to remove the cause. Before letting a man go with a fortnight's free wages, they would try him out in different positions or departments, in the hope of finding the right place for him, or would even provide him with the instruction which would enable him to make good on the job.

Just as the burden of accident compensation sinks to the minimum in the case of the employer who takes the most pains and goes to the most expense to eliminate accidents from his mill, so the burden of a legal dismissal wage will be least on the employer who picks his men most carefully, tries them out most speedily, and gives the most care to building up a permanent labor force. By providing the worker with an added

THE SOCIAL TREND

inducement to keep a good job and the employer with an added inducement to keep a good man, it would tend to stabilize American industry and favor the survival of the types of employer and worker society ought most to encourage.

XIII

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR RIGHT

§ 1

IN our time, the ease and abundance of communication have profoundly affected the general mind. The bulk of the people no longer move in the ruts worn by their ancestors. Mere tradition grows steadily weaker and rules fewer subjects. Hoary beliefs disintegrate under our very eyes. Nursery teachings, childhood impressions, imbibed prejudices, are no longer the principal sources of private opinion. More than ever before people make up their minds according to contemporary knowledge, impressions, or ideals. The number mentally supple enough to change their position on fundamentals after the fortieth year, after even the fiftieth year, rapidly grows. In a word, the minds of people seem to be passing from a crystalline state to a plastic state.

THE SOCIAL TREND

I know of far-away shut-in valleys in which the principal topics to talk over during the long Sunday visits of relatives are: who has become engaged, how the cattle are doing, and how the servants are behaving. For thousands of years personal and neighborhood affairs have formed the staple of conversation. Choked with this weed of gossip, the channels of intercourse permitted little of value to flow from mind to mind. With the growth of general interest in large and significant events these channels have cleared themselves as if by magic. The secret of the seemingly unlimited elasticity of public attention, which enables it continually to observe and react to a larger number of remote happenings, is its neglect of the petty, private matters that formerly engrossed it.

§ 2

A century ago with references to matters of deep public import the people were like a jury with one or two members paying attention, the rest asleep, musing, or gossiping. Now they are like a jury with half or two thirds of the members alert and attentive to the proceedings of the court-room. As more and more this jury

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

sits up and takes notice, it becomes a better tribunal to appeal to. Even the friends of victims of injustice as remote as incarcerated Russian progressives or the terrorized rubber-gatherers of the Congo or the Putumayo deem it worth while to reach and inform the American public. How much more easily will the wrongs of any maltreated group of our fellow-citizens be pressed upon its attention! The supplicant strives nowadays to gain the ear of the public as of old he sought to catch the eye of the Roman proconsul borne through the street in his open litter.

To-day the public pays heed to outcries that formerly fell on deaf ears. By thrusting out much gossip and trashy fiction it has made room in its mind for the dramas of social life. So many readers have found truth movingly presented more enthralling than the yarns spun by the story-tellers, that the newspaper, magazine, or book that readably recounts some tale, incredible yet true, of contemporary oppression, that throws a veracious search-light into some sepulcher of corruption, whited with pious legal phrases or sanctimonious pretexts, is likely to gain both glory and money. The muck-rakers,

THE SOCIAL TREND

despite the sensationalists and liars-for-profit that follow in their wake, deserve the credit of having roused a great many dozing jurors.

Two or three decades ago most of the sympathy of the public with the victims of wrong exhaled into thin air without being of the least direct service to them. Step by step, however, instruments have been fashioned by which an aroused public may make itself felt in a very practical way in the issue raised in a convict-camp, a mill-center, a coal-field, or a copper-district. The number of probes—private, institutional, State, and national—which are available for thrusting into an ulcerous-looking spot is greater every year. The resentment of the local powers and their on-hangers at this damaging interference from outside is very naïve. Said a lawyer at Lawrence to Mr. John Graham Brooks: "We are trying up here to mind our own business. I would n't mind a bit if the rest of the world did the same." "He thought a vigorous purge that should clean his city from the nausea of sociologists would be a good beginning." But the State of Massachusetts came into the Lawrence situation, then the Federal Government. The business element in San Diego

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

imagined it could harry I. W. W. disturbers as it pleased. "But damnation!" said one of them to Mr. Brooks, "it's nobody's business outside this town." But the newspapers looked in, then the representative of the governor, lastly the attorney-general.

Then, too, the collective mind has got itself hands as well as eyes. Above the shame and damage of such revelations local powers fear various agencies which an indignant public may employ to restrain or punish unscrupulous might. Besides remedial legislation they dread what may happen from the intervention of a State or Federal prosecutor, a public utilities commission, an industrial commission, a tenement-house commission, or a State board of health. Hence the felt need of smothering the first mutterings of discontent, of throttling those initial utterances which may attract the notice of the big justice-loving public and bring into the delicate local situation all manner of alien and unmanageable factors.

§ 3

Trade-unions and protective labor laws have brought about great improvement in the condi-

THE SOCIAL TREND

tions of many groups of workers, but there is no justification yet for slipping into a mood of complacency. Industrial accidents have been dealt with effectively in some States, but no method has been worked out by law for dealing with preventable industrial diseases. The hours of women workers have been standardized in a few States during the last few years, but legislation has done little to correct the evil of an excessive workingday for men. Trade-unions have secured no small measure of independence and security for the skilled, but the unskilled and especially the casual laborers have remained unorganized. The capitalistic method of production continually extends its sway and brings under its influence new groups of workers. The organization of capital has outrun even the organization of labor. In many fields the employer has so gained in power that the employees find themselves under a quiet, irresistible hydraulic press crushing down their manhood, their self-respect, and their hope of a larger reward out of their larger product.

Now, if ever, labor needs every weapon which its forefathers gained. Now is the worst possible time to tolerate the abridgment of any

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

constitutional guaranty won for men by the conflicts and the sacrifices of the past. And yet, during the last dozen years, the tales of the suppression of free assemblage, free speech, and free press by local authorities or by the State operating under martial law have been so numerous as to have become an old story. These rights are not trampled upon, as in the days of George III, by an arbitrary government determined to have its way in defiance of the popular will. They are attacked at the instigation of an economically and socially powerful class, itself enjoying to the full the advantages of free communication but bent on denying them to the class it holds within its power. So it is coming about that the weakest and worst-treated groups of wage-earners, the factory women, the mill operatives, the casual or seasonal laborers, the miners in isolated company-owned camps, the migratory unskilled, and the unemployed, who least of all can afford to lose any lever by which they may raise themselves, are having ancient rights wrested out of their hands under the pretext that their exercise relates, not to the lawful tactics of organizing and presenting demands backed by the threat of a strike, but

THE SOCIAL TREND

to rebellion against lawful authority and to the destruction of property.

§ 4

It is inexpressibly shocking that the rights of free communication established so long ago at such cost of patriot blood, time-tested rights which in thousands of instances have vindicated their value for moral and social progress, accepted rights which in the minds of disinterested men are as settled as any principle of human conduct can be, should with increasing frequency be flouted by strong employers and set at naught by local authorities. Are the agitators of to-day more artful or inflammatory than those of other times? Are wage-earners more ignorant, less self-controlled, less able to distinguish right from wrong or truth from error? Is there some unrepresented section of the people bent upon subverting our form of government? Is there a convinced class working resolutely and in concert to bring about a state of anarchy? No, there is no such crisis. If freedom of communication could be established in a time when most men were unable to read and write, were ignorant of the responsibilities of citizenship

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

and inexperienced in discounting the spoken or written word, how rock-fast ought it to be today, when virtually the entire population reads, and the traditions of self-restraint, of the duty upon the people of obeying the law they themselves have made, and of the righting of wrongs by orderly procedure have become deeply rooted in the overwhelming majority of the population!

No, it is not at all the approaching shadow of anarchy that has caused Detroit, Little Falls, Lawrence, Paterson, Spokane, Seattle, San Diego, Butte, Missoula, Paint Creek, Cabin Creek, Cripple Creek, Las Animas County, and a number of other towns and districts at various times within recent years to turn recreant to American principles. The constitutional rights of free communication have been denied to socially insignificant persons, sometimes in order to prevent the exposure of local political corruption and crime, but usually in order to spare certain employers the risks of a successful strike or the snaffle collective bargaining imposes upon their arbitrary will. Could any apostasy to principle be more contemptible than depriving the weak of the chief weapon by which they may achieve common economic action? Yet

THE SOCIAL TREND

nothing less sordid than this seems to lie behind the multiplying interferences with free assemblage, free discussion, and liberty of the press.

To judge from the lavish use of the club and the cell, the rantings of kept newspapers, and the bombardment from the big howitzers of social defense, one might suppose that nothing less is at stake than monogamic marriage, the life of civil officials, and the institution of private property. So great a pothor are the profits from long hours, low wages, false measurement, arbitrary fines, speeded labor, company stores, and the evasion of the law's requirements of safety and sanitation able to raise when menaced by the advent of an intrepid agitator with suggestions of organization and strike. A mortifying anti-climax must it be to the good citizen who has been drawn into sanctioning high-handed measures against "disturbers" to find later underneath the "law-and-order" movement nothing but the pecuniary alarm of a handful of greedy and arrogant local magnates, who by the unholy use of their financial power have been able to force the city authorities, the police-courts, the business men, the pulpits, and the newspapers to fight their battles!

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

What we are witnessing in recent years is not at all an anarchistic movement among wage-earners but the struggle of the worst-paid or worst-treated laborers to improve their position and exact the treatment due to men. Does any candid student of society doubt that the grievances of the sections of labor which are being organized by the I. W. W. are quite as real and serious as the grievances of which in times past the railroad men, the miners, the longshoremen, the printers, the telegraphers, the iron-molders, the structural iron-workers, and many other groups of skilled working-men complained? These past movements for the betterment of conditions were certainly accompanied by strong emotion, bitterness, class animosity, irresponsible leadership, utopian proposals, and lurid rhetoric, which lent color to the capitalists' cry that law and order were in danger. There was always enough wild language and violence by individuals to allow such officials, courts, politicians, newspapers, pulpits, and colleges as were subservient to the employing class and would fight the labor movement at its bidding to pose as the saviors of society against crime and spoliation.

I remember how in 1884 the Knights of

THE SOCIAL TREND

Labor leader I called on carefully pulled down the blinds before he would talk. And yet many of the reforms his organization sought—restriction of child labor, the establishment of bureaus of labor statistics, postal savings banks, inheritance taxes, the use of arbitration in labor disputes, the gradual introduction of the eight-hour day—have already been, or are being, realized, and few disinterested citizens would have it otherwise.

Does not the distance we have come since then in recognizing and removing remediable hardships of labor suggest that we may have a considerable stretch of travel ahead of us in the same general direction? We look back upon the wrongs and needless sufferings of a bygone generation of labor and regret that the scales did not sooner fall from our eyes. We wish that the labor of 1884 had not been denied the protection which we now acknowledge as the right of labor. But a generation hence, what rights will the ill-paid, floating, seasonal, or unskilled laborers enjoy with the full approval of all the better elements of the then society, which to-day are being denied them, while their organizations, demonstrations, pa-

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

rades, agitations, and strikes are being denounced as anarchistic and criminal? If indeed the public has nothing to learn when these sections of labor gain the lime-light and a voice, if the public knows all about the frauds and extortions of private employment agencies, the selling of jobs by foremen, the conditions in construction camps, the violation of labor laws by employers, the oppressive fines for alleged bad work, the employer system of espionage, the cutting of the piece price, etc., then the mass-meetings, parades, and demonstrations of labor may be prohibited without prejudice to their cause. So likewise if all the laborers who suffer from the same oppression are perfectly alive to their wrongs and are acting in perfect concert to obtain redress, then, perhaps, it will make no difference to them if the government arrests their speakers, confiscates their literature, jails their editors, and forbids their gatherings.

§ 5

To be sure, freedom of communication opens a way for voicing false and pernicious theories as well as for just complaints and salutary propaganda. To facilitate the circula-

THE SOCIAL TREND

tion of true and valuable doctrines while at the same time checking the promulgation of fantastic or baleful ideas would be good social policy if only there were a sure touchstone to tell the gold from the lead. But since to entrust discrimination among ideas to any man or board subjects communication to arbitrary judgment, so that presently it ceases to be free even for truth in case the truth happens to be distasteful, there is nothing left but to tolerate the propaganda of false doctrines as the inescapable price to be paid for the boon of liberty.

Although the preaching of specious folly puts truth and wisdom on the perpetual *qui vive*, it would be strange indeed if they should shrink from the test of free discussion. "Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth," says Milton, "so Truth be in the field, we do injuriously, by licencing and prohibiting, to misdoubt her strength." When one considers the enormous artillery of talent, learning, ingenuity, and eloquence the established order is able to employ in its defense, when one reflects that wealth, social influence, the school, the pulpit, the press, the professions, officials, public men, and the persons of light

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

and leading in the community can ordinarily be counted on to throw their full weight against a propaganda that is really fanatical and subversive, one wonders why society should be rocked to its base by the advent in a mill population of a few labor agitators or I. W. W. organizers. Is it not strange that, after a century of free communication during which the literacy, intelligence, discrimination, and self-control of the plain people have advanced with giant strides, the dominant class in mining and industrial centers should feel called upon to shepherd their wage-earning fellow-citizens and by the use of the ban protect their weak and callow minds against the appeals of agitators?

Let us not sound a retreat on the ground that new and shattering ideas are seeking utterance.

The proportion of our fellow-citizens who respect property and law on solid rational grounds and are proof against incendiary appeal is now far larger than in times past. Individuals may be thrown off their base by crack-brained notions, but no body of wage-earners among us has by oratory alone been brought into an inflamed and seditious state of mind. Always a working-class explosion has

THE SOCIAL TREND

been preceded by long mistreatment and oppression. I know no instance in which workers have generally accepted the heresy that government is necessarily an engine of the capitalist class, until they have seen the laws enacted to protect them violated with impunity, while their own spokesmen and leaders met with outrage from the police and repression by the lower courts. Nor does the doctrine of "no agreements" or the practice of sabotage take root among wage-earners until they have long smarted under the sense of grievances without hearing or remedy.

Counsels of desperation rarely elicit response from men aware of enjoying protection and benefit from the laws. It is not the wage-earner, as such, but the wage-earner that is intimidated and abused, who is aroused by bitter and fiery appeals. What is the magic by which a young stranger on a soap-box rouses mill operatives to the desperate resolve to strike and starve when all the time the bosses, the business men, the politicians, the editors, the teachers, and the preachers have plied them with a contrary set of ideas? Is it not that the latter have stood by uncaring while their fellow-citizens were treated as something less than men? Had the local scribes

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

and Pharisees but lifted up protesting voices, their counsels in the hour of crisis would not have fallen on deaf ears.

Repression of agitation tends to rally all the conservative, law-abiding working-men to the defense of those of their class who seem oppressed. On the other hand, only good results from a scrupulous regard for the rights of the fractious element coupled with the enlistment of the sober-minded wage-earners in efforts to solve the social problems affecting themselves. Let me quote from a private letter from an authority on the labor movement on the Pacific coast:

Last winter San Francisco was burdened with an extremely trying group of unemployed. They camped near the heart of the city and suffered from the stimulating oratory of the I. W. W.'s at all hours of the day and night. The Labor Council was called upon to assist in solving the city's problem. The members of its committee soon learned something of the difficulties that surround the giving of relief. As a result the labor papers and meetings were the most drastic in their condemnation of "grafters" and "crazy" oratory. Complete liberty of speech and assembly, combined with a demand that the more conservative wage-earners assist in solving the problem, prevented

THE SOCIAL TREND

what might have been an extremely serious situation.

Professor Eaves goes on to say:

The history of the sailors' union in San Francisco affords an instructive illustration of the way in which working-men outgrow radical leadership. Their organization was effected under the influence of the Internationalists. A glance at the document published in the Appendix of Powderly's book will show that Burdette Haskell, an early leader of the union, held views quite like those of the most radical of present I. W. W.'s. Probably this sort of fiery doctrine was needed to arouse the sailors to faith in their powers to better their conditions, but after a few years, when the organization settled down to the sober business of managing its affairs in an effective way, such hard-headed, sensible, law-abiding citizens as Furuseth, Macarthur, and Scharrenberg were put in charge.

The tactics then for controlling subversive ideas is not the application of the gag but the redress of real grievances. There is no need of the hurried resort to high-handed tyrannical measures. Our social order is not so weak as its more vociferous champions imagine. Our institutions are not, like the walls of Jericho, to be leveled by a blast upon the trumpet. What is going on under our eyes is not the break-up of

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATION

society but the painful struggle upward of sections of the laboring class which have been in the most depressed and helpless condition. In their struggle with the powerful their initial weapons are the unhindered disclosure of their wrongs and free discussion of plans for concerted action. For organized society to allow these weapons to be wrenched out of their hands would be connivance in one of the greatest iniquities that could be committed.

XIV

WAR AS DETERMINER

§ 1

KARL MARX'S doctrine of *economic determinism*, according to which it is chiefly changes in the technique of production which alter the course of society, needs to be rounded out with a doctrine of *martial determinism* which shall show how much the relations of classes, societies, peoples, races, and cultures have been influenced by the development of the technique of war.

War has always been a master force. A philosophy of history becomes a vain dream in view of the extent to which the current of history has been deflected by small differences at critical moments. Greek fire, used first against the Saracens in the seventh century, probably preserved the Byzantine Empire for several centuries against the Eastern pressure and gave

WAR AS DETERMINER

Europe a chance to become strong. It was the armor of the crusaders that enabled them to roll back the Saracens and maintain for two hundred years a Latin kingdom in Syria. Only the walls of Constantinople and Attila's ignorance of the art of siege spared the city from being laid waste by the Huns.

The native kingdoms of Mexico and South America were overthrown and the Indians enslaved by a handful of Spaniards who, however, had the enormous advantage of possessing horses, armor, and firearms. But for gunpowder, the whites of this country, instead of sweeping in a single century from the Alleghanies to the Pacific, might by now have outposts as far west as the Father of Waters. If, in the thirteenth century, the Slavs could have met the Mongols with guns, they would not have fallen under the hideous despotism which kept them far behind the other peoples of Europe in development.

As one to-day reconnoiters the Great Wall of China, that serpent in stone clambering boldly up the steepest slopes, creeping along the sheer precipices, and following ever the comb of the mountains in order that the ground may slope

THE SOCIAL TREND

from it both ways, one realizes what a perfect checkmate it must have given to the raiding nomads of Mongolia. Thanks to seventeen hundred miles of such wall, the Chinese went ahead undisturbed until, by the eighth century, they possessed undoubtedly the most advanced civilization in the world.

Thus the destiny of societies and civilizations has turned on the issue of battle, and this has often been determined by the technique of fighting. Warfare, in fact, undergoes an evolution due, not to changes in the ethics and psychology of the combatants, but to *invention*. Any new weapon or tactics which proves effective is sure of early adoption. The dropping of the old but inferior is much prompter in the military field than in the industrial field, for, in a matter of life and death, no people is so foolish as to follow blindly the rut of the past. Be it never so custom-bound, a race will discard its old-time weapons and tactics of fighting once it has suffered from new and more deadly weapons and tactics.

Now, within our own time the evolution of warfare has been greatly accelerated by the inven-

WAR AS DETERMINER

tors, and the trend of this evolution is fateful for the group development of mankind. For one thing the cumulative effect of modern martial inventions has been to push warfare constantly in the direction of capitalism. The amount of lethal capital the average soldier works with has greatly increased while the cost of the battleship has grown out of all proportion to the number required to man it. The overwhelming growth of the machinery factor has forever laid the affrighting specter of the subjugation of the civilized by brave and fecund barbarians such as broke through the defense of the Roman Empire. The easy destruction of the dervishes by machine-guns at the battle of Omdurman settled it that henceforth the barbarian is out of the running save as the instrument of an advanced people.

A second consequence of war becoming capitalistic is that only the wealthy or highly industrial nations can wage war with any prospect of success. The money cost of fighting having grown much faster than the blood cost, that belligerent is doomed to defeat which has not either great resources and credit for buying war ma-

THE SOCIAL TREND

terials or else an abundance of technical knowledge and industrial skill to divert to their manufacture.

A third consequence is the greater time necessary for fabricating an efficient fighting machine. Big guns, turrets, emplacements, disappearing gun-carriages, and battle-ships cannot be improvised, but must be begun months before they can be used. The soldier, too, is not to be made in a day, but is becoming like a skilled artisan who must be trained for a considerable time. The result is that less and less dares a nation to consider its potential defensive resources as equivalent to available resources. Real security calls for preparedness, and preparedness becomes steadily more costly as warfare grows more capitalistic.

The advance of invention is, moreover, so rapid that war capital soon comes to be out of date. An improved rifle is adopted, and at once millions of rifles of the old pattern become junk. A nation lays out some scores of millions in equipping its army with thousands of field-guns and suddenly some inventor of a gun of longer range or quicker fire obliges it to scrap them all. The interval between the proud launching of an iron-

WAR AS DETERMINER

clad and its last service as target for the guns of a younger vessel continually shortens. The consequence is that the burden of armed peace approximates that of war and the nations welcome war as possibly opening a door of escape from the crushing weight of incessant rearmament.

§ 2

Another way in which martial invention bends the stream of social history is by altering the relative strength of *attack* and *defense*. Walls, moats, drawbridges, casemates, mines, disappearing gun-carriages, armor-plate, steel turrets, abattis, wire entanglements, anti-aircraft guns, and strategic railways are landmarks in the development of defense. Battering-rams, mortars, siege-guns, armor-piercing projectiles, asphyxiating gas, hand-grenades, bomb-dropping aircraft, torpedoes, and submarines have told particularly on the side of attack. The distinction between attack and defense signifies most in land fighting. In sea fighting the distinction is less important and in air fighting it disappears altogether, the reason being that no uniform and fluid medium can be made to furnish either shel-

THE SOCIAL TREND

ter to the defenders or obstacles to the assailants.

Now, the relation between the defense and the attack of a given terrain is an imperious determiner of social destiny. When defense has little advantage over attack, numbers count, conquest is easy, the little peoples cower before the big peoples, empires become more formidable the bigger they grow, and the nations are in unstable equilibrium. When, on the other hand, smokeless powder, high-power firearms, machine-guns, steel turrets, and land mines make the defense many times stronger than the attack, a state that is strong in defense finds itself weak in invading the territory of another. Small peoples with powerful neighbors are able to maintain their independence. The aggressive empire is held by some handful of brave mountaineers and the nations tend to remain each in its own place.

Those who believe that true civilization is spread by peaceful radiation rather than by force of arms will rejoice when the developing technique of warfare gives a great advantage to defense and will grieve when it allows attack to overtake defense. When the new forty-two centimeter howitzers at a stroke wiped out most of the military value of the world's forts, the fu-

WAR AS DETERMINER

ture of the little nations and the peace-loving peoples looked black indeed. The unexpected development of the art of trench resistance has, however, restored them some measure of security. The military failure of the Zeppelins is another ray of hope in the gloom.

Of course, no one would wish defense to be so strong as to guarantee the success of every revolt and hence make large states impossible. The battering-ram was the answer to the mud walls of Babylonian towns, but to the thick stone walls of the dark ages there was no answer until gunpowder made it possible to mine them or breach them with cannon-balls. When count or baron or bishop could flout the authority of any king not strong enough to beleaguer him and starve him into submission, the state became too decentralized to fulfil its civilizing mission, and private war was the order of the day. It was gunpowder that enabled law to quell the near-anarchy of the feudal régime.

To-day, however, national freedom and the independent evolution of the peoples are bound up with the art of war taking such a course of development as shall make aggression costly and dangerous.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 3

There is no assurance that war and the dread of war will be less potent in deflecting and determining the life of society than they have been. Indeed, it is possible that the hand of Mars will be heavier upon us in the future. The improvement of communication lowers those natural barriers and wipes out those distances which formerly gave the nations a sense of security. Moreover, far from arriving at settled spheres and final relations between the nations, we find ourselves in a tumultuously dynamic epoch which will certainly outlast this century.

There is population pressure, which tends to control the policy of Japan, Russia, and Germany, and will eventually shape the policy of China. The diffusion over the globe of the arts of saving life, long before the masses have abandoned blind multiplication, threatens to subject the comfortable peoples to violent endeavors at reajustment on the part of the teeming peoples. If surplus population does not migrate, it must at least find a vent abroad for its products. Hence, the population pressure reflects itself in a struggle among the nations for colonies

WAR AS DETERMINER

and dependencies to serve as markets. Since the secretion of capital goes on at an accelerated pace, there is an eager quest for opportunities out over the globe to invest capital in the profitable exploitation of natural resources. The appeal of capitalistic syndicates to their national government to find them such opportunities, to protect them in the resulting property rights, and to checkmate their rivals makes states aggressive and unsettles friendly international relations.

We have no warrant for expecting soon an economic equilibrium among the different regions of the globe. Asia and Africa have been making progress, but Europe and North America have been forging ahead still faster. The interval between the advanced countries and the backward countries determines the eagerness of the former to act economically upon the latter, and there is no prospect that this interval will lessen in our time. And it is precisely the scramble of the advanced nations to take part in the control, settlement, and exploitation of the rest of the world which constitutes the chief trouble-breeder among them.

THE SOCIAL TREND

§ 4

How often we hear said : "*This* is to be the *last* war!" These outbursts of destructive human energy so shock the growing humane feeling and are so alien to the habits of thought fostered by industrialism that civilized man refuses to recognize their inevitableness. Yet, if anything may be safely predicted, it is that wars as bad as this will occur in the future unless a Great Union be formed to canalize *international* rivalries as the American Union has canalized *interstate* rivalries.

No doubt this generation will not tolerate another such orgy of destruction. Through our time war will be known for what it is. But when the cripples, widows, and orphans are gone, when invention and the exploitation of fresh natural resources have lightened the war debts and have created a new basis for national borrowing, when mothers yet unborn have reared millions of youths to be bred in a febrile nationalism and inflamed with a machine-made patriotism, then the dynasts, the *Junkers*, the traders, and the drill-masters will prepare the materials for another explosion on perhaps a still vaster scale.

WAR AS DETERMINER

Incredible? But where is the force that will be able to prevent it? May we look to religion for any clearer or more authoritative utterances as to the wickedness of bloodshed? Is there the slightest prospect that the peace movement will control the opinion-forming agencies and the prestige commanded by highly organized governments reaching out for lands, markets, and dependencies in the less developed portions of the world? Nor will the clearest demonstration of the economic waste of war and armament have more effect upon commercial minds than it has had in the past. The aggressive nation that forces militarism upon its unwilling neighbors always dreams of recouping itself by conquests and indemnities. The growing aversion to wanton aggression, instead of hampering the provocative foreign policy of statesmen, simply obliges them to resort to a more elaborate hypocrisy. The extent to which the people may be deluded with the idea they are dying in a war of defense seems limitless.

In the absence of visible menace or actual aggression nothing but state-worship will induce the common people to face the burdens and horrors of war. How, then, if among the masses

THE SOCIAL TREND

there spread a resentment at the ghastly sacrifices they are called upon to make for this idol? Is there any hope of a turning of popular opinion to the wholesome internationalism that captivated thinkers of half a century ago?

The fact is, nationalism to-day has a far stronger appeal than it had in the days of Cobden and Bright. The evils of unregulated machine industry and private capitalism have opened to the state a new sphere of service and have led the bulk of the people to look to it, to trust it, and to love it for the protection it affords. The popularity the state gains by its salutary intervention in the industrial and social field it has very cleverly turned to account in winning support for its aggressive policies. Thus much of what is saved by its beneficent activities is poured into the insatiable maw of armament and war. The paternal state saves the working-man from unguarded machinery, industrial poisons, and a pauper old age, only to oblige him to perish miserably in battle as a state slave. Under its present guidance the modern state has proved to be something the working people can neither live *without* nor, alas, live *with*.

WAR AS DETERMINER

§ 5

But suppose democracy spreads. What if the working class, instead of remaining a mere beneficiary of state action, should succeed in wresting control of the state from the land-owning aristocracy, the capitalists, and the traders? What if foreign policies were determined by working-class leaders or by statesmen dependent upon working-class support?

A political revolution in this sense would solve our problem only in case it were general. Otherwise peace-loving democracies might be forced into the hated path of armament and war by the pace-making of a single powerful militarist autocracy. Furthermore, democracies may be reckoned as anti-militarist only in case they limit their numbers. The sense of pressure, which will soon appear in a blindly multiplying people, can be successfully appealed to by the jingoist demagogue who argues for breaking by force or the threat of force into the preserves of some less crowded people. With mystic clerics, a priori moralists, sentimentalists, militarists, aristocrats, and monarchs at one in teaching the people that it is a deadly sin to restrict the size of the family, population pressure seems likely

THE SOCIAL TREND

to resume its ancient baleful rôle of gadfly.

No doubt much may be done to drag foreign policy out of its dark corner, but it is vain to dream of putting a brake on the chariot of Mars by relegating to the people the determination of foreign policy. The citizens at large lack the basis of a reasoned judgment on such matters; so that their vote could record nothing but their comparative confidence in the champions of rival policies. Idle likewise is it to demand that, before a nation be committed, the question of peace or war shall be decided by a popular referendum. Aside from the fact that, owing to the technique of warfare, the delaying nation may put itself at a grave disadvantage, there is the difficulty that the people are ignorant of the interests involved. Much as the people may hate war, they hold some things as worse than war. As to what is really at stake in a dispute with another country they have no means of judging save what their leaders tell them; so that their vote amounts to nothing more than an expression of confidence or doubt respecting the statesmen at the helm.

Some hope much from the admission of women to the electorate, arguing that they are free

WAR AS DETERMINER

from the innate pugnacity of males and that those who bring life into existence will instinctively recoil from the policies which lead to its wholesale destruction. It is certain that if women obeyed the promptings of their own natures their participation in government would strengthen the party of concession and compromise. But there is little indication that enfranchised women are going to register in politics their native intuitions and reactions. There must come first an intellectual emancipation of women which has little more than begun. The readiness of most women to believe what men tell them as to matters remote from their ken and their hysterical, uncritical response to the appeals of militarists wearing the mask of patriotism forbid us to expect much from their votes.

§ 6

It appears, then, that the nations taken separately have no power to extricate themselves from the vortex into which they are being sucked. As the horizon darkens, a people so far from the center of strife as the Americans find themselves obliged to abandon the traditions of a

THE SOCIAL TREND

century and to begin casting their sons and their substance into the lap of the war god. Not only will such sacrifices tend to grow with time but they will be made use of by militarists to spur jaded peoples across the sea into making still greater sacrifices for "defense and security."

It is a great pity that the means provided for defense admit usually of being employed as well for aggression, and therefore may inspire suspicion, fear, and counter-arming in other nations. If there were a kind of Cannon which would go off only when on home ground, or a type of military training which would be useless away from the national soil, the government adopting them would be no more minatory than if it girdled the country with cement-lined trenches. The submarine torpedo-boat did at first present itself as peculiarly a weapon of protection. But the rapid development of a sea-going submarine able to create havoc at a long distance from its home base has converted it into an offensive arm of great deadliness. The devising of the superdreadnaught carrying guns of a weight and caliber which had been supposed to be possible only in coast-defense guns has

WAR AS DETERMINER

wiped out another distinction between the instruments of defense and those of attack.

The civilized peoples find themselves, therefore, confronting this situation:¹

1. The treaties between the great powers guaranteeing the security of the little peoples have become "mere scraps of paper."

2. Warfare has become a capitalistic enterprise and fighting a skilled occupation, so that, more and more, success in war hinges on elaborate preparation.

3. The armament and training a militarist government desires in support of aggression may be secured of its people under the pretext that they are necessary for national safety.

4. The prudent preparations a peace-loving people makes for defense may be construed by other peoples as designed for aggression.

5. Armament and training acquired for defense admit of being employed in aggression in case the nation changes its attitude toward international law and morality.

6. The nation that outarms the others runs no risk in so doing and *may* be rewarded for its preparedness by success in war.

¹ Written at the close of 1915.

THE SOCIAL TREND

7. The nation that is first to disarm or that lags behind the rest in preparation for war runs the risk of being thwarted or beaten.

8. From the foregoing it follows that the war-loving nations have the power to force the peace-loving nations into the gloomy path of armament or war, whereas the peace-loving nations have no power to force the war-loving nations into the sunny path of peace. The men of Mars set the pace for the rest of the world.

A cool, relentless analysis of the situation discloses, then, little ground for hopeful anticipation. On the contrary, the prospect is one of the blackest that humanity has ever faced: a spread over the world of the policy of competitive armament; an ever larger share of production shunted into the bottomless pit of preparedness; a more general sacrifice of the flowering years of male life to military training; a gradual starvation of such state services as education, research, public recreation, and social amelioration—all this, punctuated from time to time by colossal wars resulting in the slaughter of millions and the laying waste of populous and flourishing areas of the globe.

Such is the appalling outlook if we continue

WAR AS DETERMINER

on the national line. Is there no door of escape? One, indeed, there is. A thousand times groups of men have faced a crisis like that which confronts the nations. The well-disposed have been obliged to go always armed and on the *qui vive* because of the presence in their midst of a few bullies who encroached upon others and would not submit the resulting disputes to arbitration. A traveler informs us that among the feud-ridden Berdurani of northeastern Afghanistan

the villages and fields bristle in all directions with round towers. These are constantly occupied by men at enmity with their neighbors in the same or adjoining villages, who, perched up in their little shooting boxes, watch the opportunity of putting a bullet into each other's body with the most persevering patience. The fields, even, are studded with these round towers, and the men holding them most jealously guard their lands from anyone with whom they are at feud. . . . If even a fowl strays from its owner into the grounds of another it is sure to receive a bullet from the adversary's tower. So constant are their feuds that it is a well-known fact that the village children are taught never to walk in the center of the road, but always from the force of early habit walk stealthily along under cover of the wall nearest to any tower.

This recalls the chronic strife among the

THE SOCIAL TREND

Scotch Highlanders of olden times and the Albanians of to-day, the vendettas of Corsica, the feuds of Kentucky mountaineers, and the hereditary enmities between adjacent Chinese villages—all due, *not to love of combat, but to the absence of law*. In the icelandic saga of Burnt Njal we see very clearly that domestic peace has been brought about, not by the spread of the spirit of reasonableness and love, but by the creation of courts the awards of which have force behind them. Men united to create and to support legal institutions, not out of friendliness, but because they had found their feuds intolerable. On the whole *the pacific disposition has been the offspring rather than the parent of the régime of law*.

Now the only way of escape of the advanced nations from the ruinous results of their inevitable competition for place and advantage in the backward parts of the globe lies in their combining to create an organization provided with the means of adjudicating disputes and enforcing awards. Thinking in terms of the *nation* is destroying the people of Europe at the rate of ten thousand a day. Is it not high time we were thinking in terms of some Inter-nation,

WAR AS DETERMINER

League of Peace, World-federation, or other vast unit capable of keeping the peace without stereotyping the *status quo* or hindering the survival of the fittest and the success of the adapted?

